


BR 121 .P33 1929
Page, Kirby, 1890-1957.
Jesus or Christianity



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

JESUS OR CHRISTIANITY.


JESUS OR CHRISTIANITY

A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

BY

KIRBY PAGE

Editor, THE WORLD TOMORROW



GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK

DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.

1929

COPYRIGHT, 1929
BY DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES AT
THE COUNTRY LIFE PRESS
GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. WHAT IS THE RELIGION OF JESUS?	I
1. The Social Background	3
2. The Teaching of Jesus	14
3. Why Was Jesus Killed?	23
4. The Meaning of the Cross.	31
II. CAUSES OF THE RAPID EXPANSION OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY	53
1. The Conviction That Jesus Had Risen and the Expectation of His Early Bodily Return	54
2. The Preaching of a Gospel of Salvation in a Decaying World.	55
3. The Practice of Love and Sharing	61
4. Personal Purity and Family Loyalty	64
5. Rejection of Violence and War	68
6. The Exhibition of Unbounded Courage and Sacrificial Devotion	72
7. The Solidarity and Discipline of the Christian Fellowship	77
8. Compromise with Prevailing Beliefs and Practices.	80
III. CONTRASTS BETWEEN HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS	87
1. <i>Christianity and War</i>	87
(1) Constantine, the Christian Warrior	87
(2) The Crusades	90
(3) Wars of Religion	95
(4) Secular Wars	TOI

2. <i>Persecution by Christians</i>	113
(1) Early Theological Controversies	113
(2) The Inquisition	120
(3) Use of Violence by Protestants	128
(4) Massacre of the Jews	136
(5) Torture of Witches	139
(6) Conflict with Science	143
3. <i>Personal Habits and Beliefs of Christians</i>	150
(1) Asceticism	150
(2) Immorality of the Clergy	159
(3) Superstition and Magic	164
(4) Beliefs Concerning God	171
4. <i>Property and Power in Christian History</i>	177
(1) Ecclesiastical Corruption	177
(2) Feudalism	185
(3) Divine Right of Kings	191
(4) Industrial Revolution	196
(5) Slavery	207
IV. CONTRASTS BETWEEN CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIANITY AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS	223
1. The War System	224
2. Capital Punishment	237
3. Racial Discrimination and Lynching	240
4. Economic Injustice and Strife	249
5. Ecclesiasticism and Denominationalism	268
V. IS THE RELIGION OF JESUS PRACTICABLE?	275
1. If Our Good Will Is Intelligent	278
2. If We Create Adequate Social Organization	283
3. If We Abandon the Doctrine That the End Justifies the Means	291
4. If We Are Willing to Take the Consequences	296
5. If We Discover and Utilize Spiritual Resources	305
INDEX	321

JESUS OR CHRISTIANITY

CHAPTER I

WHAT IS THE RELIGION OF JESUS?

THIS volume is a study in *contrasts*: divergencies between the religion of Jesus and organized Christianity. No attempt is made in these pages to write a comprehensive history of the latter nor to summarize its incalculable contribution to human welfare. Our libraries are now filled with eulogies of Christianity. Innumerable writers have already told the story of how, in countless ways, it has blessed mankind.¹ My purpose, instead, is to emphasize the fact that, in spite of the immeasurable good accomplished by Christianity, it has accumulated so many alien and hostile elements as to make it a different religion from the simple faith of its founder.

The religion of Jesus can best be described in terms of the home: God is Father, men are brothers, all life is a domestic affair. "Love God and love your fellow man" is its all-embracing injunction. To build the Family of God, where all members of society will dwell in right relations with the Father and with each other, is the supreme objective. Attitudes and practices which are alien and disruptive to the home should never be indulged in, while the virtues of the

¹See C. L. Brace, *Gesta Christi*; also C. D. Eldridge, *Christianity's Contribution to Civilization*.

family should always abound. Each member of the household must run the risks inherent in the abandonment of retaliation and revenge and the reliance upon good will and sacrifice. To live every day as a good member of God's home: this is the religion of Jesus. *It is imperative that the contrasts between Christianity and Jesus be clearly revealed and strongly emphasized.* First, because the real significance of Jesus is obscured by the widespread belief that organized Christianity truly reflects his religion; and second, because it will be practically impossible to abolish giant evils while they are hallowed by the blessing of the churches. As long as ministers and laymen labour under the delusion that contemporary Christianity is the same religion that Jesus practised they will remain immunized against his way of life and will lack the vision and power to overthrow entrenched iniquity.

Therefore, we are under the painful necessity of tabulating in cumulative form some of the outstanding violations of the spirit of Jesus found in the history of Christianity. Because there are so many sordid pages in the record, it may help to prevent misunderstanding as to my purpose if the reader is informed at the outset that I am a Christian minister and write as one on the inside; rejoicing in the glorious achievements of the church; grieving over its shortcomings and cruelties; hoping that it will withdraw its support from iniquity and take the religion of Jesus seriously.

No attempt is made in this study to evaluate the relative degree of good and evil in Western civiliza-

tion. If more space is devoted to the latter than to the former it is because this procedure is necessary in order to emphasize the contrasts between two religions. A few months ago I edited a volume entitled *Recent Gains in American Civilization*² which reversed the process and set forth the more favourable aspects of our national life. This present discussion, therefore, is neither a history of Christianity nor an interpretation of Western civilization. It is merely *a study in contrasts*.

Since I have written primarily for ministers and lay members of the churches, I have been far more critical of organized Christianity than if I had been writing for non-Christians. This is also the reason why I have devoted so little space to an enumeration of the glorious achievements of the churches. *The reader must, therefore, constantly remember that this presentation by no means constitutes the whole story.* If the restricted nature of this inquiry is kept in mind, it seems to me that a study in contrasts is a legitimate and profitable undertaking.

I. THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND³

Jesus lived in a turbulent world. Foreign conquerors ruled Palestine throughout his lifetime. Even the religious institutions of the Jews were under the supervision and control of pagans from abroad. Dire

²Published by Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York City.

³See V. G. Simkhovitch, *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*; Samuel Dickey, *The Constructive Revolution of Jesus*; S. J. Case, *Jesus*; S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity*; Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*; George Foot Moore, *Judaism*; Chester Charlton McCown, *The Genesis of the Social Gospel*.

economic distress was everywhere prevalent. Hatred had become a fine art, and armed revolts against Rome occurred at least four times during the days of Jesus.

Bondage was an ancient and frequent experience for the Jews. Many masters had they served. Now it was the Romans. The entire land was dominated by these exponents of law and justice. Politically, economically, ecclesiastically, the Romans reigned. In 63 B. C. the famous general, Pompey, captured Jerusalem and slaughtered twelve thousand Jews. For a century previously the Hebrew people had been self-governing, beginning with the Maccabean revolt in 164 B. C. Prior to that they had been ruled at various periods by Greeks, Syrians, Egyptians, Persians, Babylonians, and Assyrians. They had undergone long practice in adjusting themselves to servitude.

Jesus was born at the very end of the thirty-three-year reign of Herod the Great, of whom it was said that "he stole along to his throne like a fox, he ruled like a tiger, and died like a dog." Augustus had appointed this alien Idumean as king of Palestine. He was a king who was not actually a ruler, being merely the agent of Rome. Herod was able but ruthless. He was a magnificent builder and an efficient administrator, but he had one of the famous tempers of history. Even wife and children could not escape his murderous fury.

When Herod the Great died in 4 B. C. Rome consented to the division of the territory among his three surviving sons. Archelaus was assigned to

Judea, Antipas secured Galilee, Philip ruled in the northern and northeastern region. As soon as Archelaus ascended the throne a series of bloody riots broke out, but the rebels were no match for the trained soldiery. Three thousand Jews were slaughtered like sheep before the altar, even the courtyard of the Temple being filled with dead patriots. After nine years Archelaus was removed and Judea was again attached to the province of Syria and ruled thereafter by Roman procurators or governors. Antipas, the King Herod referred to during the public ministry of Jesus, was weak, dissolute, and treacherous. Philip seems to have been more tolerant but he does not often appear in the record.

The agents of Rome governed with moderation. It is true that there were excesses and terrible crimes, but compared with other conquerors, the Romans exercised self-restraint. The Jews had fared worse. Life and property were now reasonably secure; majestic public buildings had been erected; the Temple had been rebuilt and as a rule religious worship was not interfered with; trade had been stimulated; famous roads led to the markets of the world; the high seas were safe from pirates.

But there were grievous burdens. Taxes were exorbitant. The glories of the Imperial City, the expenses of the imperial army, the upkeep of the administration, the cost of public edifices and highways—all these required money. Subject peoples must pay and pay heavily. A water tax, a meat tax, a salt tax, a road tax, a house tax, and a city tax—all these the Romans exacted. Legal rates of taxes

were high; the amounts collected were outrageous. Taxes were farmed out to agents and graft was rampant. So rapacious were these tax gatherers that the very word "publican" has become a synonym for "sinner."

Furthermore, the Jews were subject to double taxation: political taxation—tribute, they called it—and religious taxation. The priestly theocracy exercised civil as well as ecclesiastical authority and religious taxation was a deeply established practice. There were at least twelve varieties of such taxes, including the tithe, the sin offering, the thank offering, and the first-born of animals. In addition there were free-will offerings. Then there was graft: dishonest exchange in the Temple and extortionate price for sacrificial animals. The populace staggered under the burden. The total taxation of the Jewish people in the days of Jesus reached the stupendous total of *thirty to forty per cent. of the national income.*⁴

There were religious grievances, too. Imagine Mussolini deposing the Pope or Lenin unfrocking the Patriarch! No more sacrilegious than for the Roman procurator to unseat the sacred high priest nine times within that many years! Moreover, the Romans were frequently guilty of blasphemy. The full meaning of the situation cannot be understood unless one remembers that the Jews passionately believed themselves to be God's chosen people; not merely different from other nations, but uniquely and eternally God's own.

⁴See *The Economic Background of the Gospels*, by Frederick C. Grant, p. 105.

No wonder the Jews were always revolting!¹⁵ Anything was preferable to the blasphemous tyranny of alien pagans. About the time when Jesus as a boy of twelve was taken to the Temple, Judas of Galilee led a violent revolt against the Romans. The result was tragedy. Sepphoris was burned to the ground and its inhabitants sold into slavery. Two thousand Jewish patriots were crucified. Judas and his followers were mourned as martyrs in freedom's cause. A few years previous Theudas and four hundred comrades made a similar attempt and met the same fate. Luke refers to those Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices. Josephus tells us that Herod beheaded John because of fear that he would instigate another revolution. Barabbas was an insurrectionist who had committed murder during a revolt.

What could one hundred per cent. Jewish patriots expect from the agents of Rome? Law and justice? Yes, if obedient; otherwise, ruthless slaughter. There was no sentimentality about the Romans. Discipline and duty made them stern and relentless. Rebels got no quarter; only glory. It is altogether probable that Jesus was familiar with the scene of a Jewish rebel surrounded by Roman spears carrying his cross up the hillside. The Roman legions were mighty and deliverance seemed impossible except at the hand of God. But He had promised. When the Messiah comes! And so the hearts of the nation beat as one with expectancy. How long, O Lord, how long? Perhaps Jehovah will drive out the Romans with a

¹⁵See Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff.; Case, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-144.

mighty miracle, perhaps He will send the Son of David to lead his warriors to victory, as He had upheld the arm of Judas Maccabeus in the previous century. Thus it was that during the lifetime of Jesus the question of freedom was the outstanding problem before the Jewish people. Political independence, economic relief, religious integrity, all awaited the Deliverer. The Kingdom of God could never come as long as the Romans ruled.

In the meantime, what could be done? Five answers were given by Essenes, Sadducees, Pharisees, Zealots, and the disciples of John the Baptist.⁶ The *Essenes* were communists and ascetics. All possessions were held in common: dwellings, food, clothing, money. They lived chiefly in villages of their own. Most of them were celibates, their colonies being perpetuated by adoption. They were opposed to violence; that is, until the great crisis of the year 70, when they were found in the front ranks of the Jewish patriots. The devotees spent their time in hard work and in the religious exercises of prayer, fasting, bathing. Essenism was an early form of social utopia.

The *Sadducees* were the Jewish aristocracy, the official and wealthy class. As they held office and enjoyed special privileges, they were more friendly with the Romans. They considered rebellion hopeless and thought it better to bargain with the invader. They believed that ultimately God would send the Messiah and that in the meantime the Jews should

⁶See Klausner, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-228; Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 56 ff.; Dickey, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-38.

get along as well as possible. Above all, the Romans must not be antagonized by futile revolts. This policy of the Sadducees may have been determined in part by their disbelief in the resurrection of the dead. If any rewards were ever to be secured they had better be possessed then and there. The Romans had prizes to offer and it seemed wise to make friends with Mammon. And so they wore soft raiment and fared sumptuously; all the while railing at the wild radicals who threatened their privileges and security. The group that most completely identified themselves with Roman and Greek culture were known as the Herodians.

The *Pharisees* were the popular party. Like all other devout Jews they were strict monotheists and ardent believers in revealed religion. The law came from God, every phrase of it, ceremonial requirements and ethical duties being equally binding. The wisdom of the Almighty must not be questioned. Implicit obedience was necessary to redemption. And so they were legalists. Since a series of rigid laws could not be applied literally in all the complex relationships of life, it was necessary to liberalize the code by definitive commentaries. The result was that parallel with the Law itself had grown up interpretations of the elders. These oral traditions came to be regarded as equally binding. Altogether there were six hundred and thirteen laws, leaving no relationship or emergency unlegislated for; with thirty-nine kinds of acts forbidden on the Sabbath. Insistence upon the authoritative character of these interpretations constituted one difference from the

Sadducees, the latter being loose-constructionists. If Israel would faithfully observe the Law for a single day it was believed that the Messiah would come. The sacrificial system was regarded as divinely instituted and essential to salvation. A famous rabbi went so far as to say: "Were it not for attendance on sacrifices, heaven and earth would not endure." The horror with which these literalists looked upon any violation of the law is indicated by an eminent Jewish teacher, Dr. Joseph Klausner, who says: "To the orthodox Pharisee (and to the modern orthodox Jew) the violation of the Sabbath and the oppression of the hireling were alike crimes deserving death (and for the average Jew of all times the former seems the worse crime)."⁷ Professor George Foot Moore tells of a band of refugees in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes who "let themselves be slaughtered, with their wives and children, rather than profane the Sabbath by raising a hand to defend themselves."⁸

The Pharisees were passionately concerned about political freedom, chiefly because the conqueror threatened or prevented religious liberty. Acknowledging God alone as King, they looked upon the Romans as blasphemers and idolators.

John and his followers held many views in common with the Pharisees and were tinged with Essenism. John lived in the desert as an ascetic, wearing the garb of a prophet, and calling his hearers to drastic acts of renunciation. But he differed from the Essenes in that he did not believe in complete separa-

⁷*Op. cit.*, p. 216.

⁸*Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 26.

tion from society. On the contrary, he and his disciples regarded themselves as evangelists called to prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah. John was a devout Jew and there is no evidence that he ever broke completely with Judaism. His emphasis was on repentance and his message was apocalyptic in character. The Messianic age could be hastened by an inner change of heart. His demands were ethical and moral, but he seems to have observed the ceremonial law. Certainly he and his disciples emphasized fasting. On the other hand, he never fully identified himself with Jesus. Although the latter was undoubtedly influenced by John and eulogized him as one of the earth's greatest, he never regarded the prophet of the wilderness as a member of his own inner circle. There was more or less hostility between the followers of John and those of Jesus, and the two groups never merged completely. Even after Jesus' death we find references to John's disciples. Paul found it necessary to instruct Apollos of Alexandria and certain others who had been initiated "by the baptism of John" only. John was a great reformer with a profoundly ethical and spiritual message, and it is possible that later he might have identified himself completely with the cause of Jesus if he had not been beheaded as a potential revolutionist by Herod.⁹

The *Zealots* were the radicals of the day. They advocated and plotted violent revolution. The political tyranny and economic exploitation of the Romans

⁹ See an essay by Professor E. W. Parsons in *Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by S. J. Case.

were considered utterly intolerable and patience was regarded as a crime. Daggers and swords were advocated as means of hastening the Messiah's advent. No risk was too great to run, the cost must not be counted. The only alternatives seemed to be liberty or death. "They possess unbounded love for liberty," says Josephus, "and look upon God as their only leader and ruler; it was a light thing for them to go forth to meet death, nor did they regard the death of their companions and kinsfolk, if only they might save themselves from the burden of a human ruler. . . . What I have said has not told all the greatness of their soul and their readiness to endure sufferings."

It was in this kind of world that Jesus lived all his days. Six decades before his birth the Romans came. Four decades after his crucifixion the Holy City was utterly demolished by the imperial legions. Never for an hour during these one hundred and thirty-five years were the Jews reconciled to their bondage. "Scarcely a year went by," says Dr. Joseph Klausner, "during this century without wars or other disturbances; wars, rebellions, outbreaks, and riots; and this state of things prevailed in the Land of Israel throughout the whole epoch which preceded Jesus and prevailed also during his lifetime."¹⁰

The New Testament abounds with evidence concerning the tense situation which prevailed.¹¹ According to the record of Matthew, Jesus was born at Bethlehem, where Joseph and Mary had gone for the Roman census, which was to be used as a basis for

¹⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 167.

¹¹Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff.; Dickey, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-114.

taxation. The story of the slaying of the children of Bethlehem by Herod assumes new significance if the historical background is kept in mind. Two revolutionary leaders, Theudas and Judas, are mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles. Luke tells of certain Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices. Barabbas is described as "one who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison." Simon the Zealot was numbered among the Twelve and some traditions maintain that Judas Iscariot was also a Zealot. Jesus was frequently referred to as "son of David," and on one occasion the populace gave him a royal reception by spreading their garments in his way and crying aloud their hosannas in anticipation of his Messianic reign. The sons of Zebedee requested the honour of sitting at his right and left when he ascended the throne. The chief priests once assembled a special council and said: "If we let him alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation." On one occasion the Pharisees sought to trap Jesus with the famous question: "Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar or not?" An affirmative answer would have repelled patriotic Jews, while a negative response would have embroiled him with the Roman authorities. In the record tax collectors are usually classed with outcasts and sinners.

The charge against Jesus before Pilate was that of sedition: "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king. And Pilate asked

him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews?" When Pilate sought to release Jesus he was restrained by the reminder, "If thou release this man thou art not Cæsar's friend; everyone that maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." In order to humiliate the patriotic Jews Pilate placed a sign above the cross on which Jesus was crucified: "The King of the Jews." Even after the resurrection of Jesus his disciples were still expecting him to bring national deliverance and freedom: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom of Israel?" Several times Jesus referred to the probable results of hatred and rebellion against Rome. Once he said: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies then know that her desolation is at hand. Then let them that are in Judea flee into the mountains." At every turn Jesus was confronted with *the* problem; everywhere *the* expectation.

2. THE TEACHING OF JESUS¹²

The religion of Jesus begins and ends in the home. All life is a domestic affair. The universal family embraces every race and tongue. Man's primary purpose is to establish the Family of God, where all persons will dwell in right relations with the Father and with each other. The way to create God's home is to live every day as a good member of the family. Only those ends are worthy which are consonant with the family spirit and only those methods are justifiable which are appropriate in the home. The domestic

¹² See E. F. Scott, *The Ethical Teachings of Jesus*; J. Middleton Murry, *Jesus: Man of Genius*; S. J. Case, *Jesus*; Walter E. Bundy, *The Religion of Jesus*.

virtues must never be repudiated or abandoned, even in hours of extreme peril. Members of the household must assume the risks and accept the consequences of treating each other under every conceivable circumstance as kinsmen. Love God and love your neighbour. Live to-day as if the ideal society has already come to pass. The Kingdom of God is within you. It is all about you.

God is Father and perfectly exemplifies the spirit of the home. Wisdom and understanding are His. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without His knowledge. Active and persistent is He in the effort to establish the perfect family. He is loving and has personal affection for each of His children. With Him all things are possible that can be accomplished by love. Ever present and accessible, He is eager to enter into an intimate comradeship with every member of the household. He makes the sun shine on the evil and the good and the rain to fall upon the just and the unjust. He is forgiving and always goes out to meet the prodigal. Patient and long-suffering beyond comparison, holy and righteous altogether, He ever couples mercy with justice. Never does he violate the spirit of the home.

Jesus not only believed in God, he trusted Him. It is one thing to give intellectual assent to the idea that God is Father; it is a very different thing to rely upon Him in all the crises of life. The God of Jesus is accessible, responsive, coöperative, and powerful. Jesus unburdened himself to God as naturally as the bud unfolds to the sun. At the break of dawn, in the silences of midnight, and in every hour of need he

talked with God and listened to His voice. Without questioning, he assumed the sympathy and affection of the Father. Since his whole life was dedicated to the doing of God's will, he never doubted that help would be forthcoming from the Eternal. Jesus staked everything upon the reliability of God. Apart from this faith and this dependence, his life is meaningless and his teachings become tragic mockery. The religion and the ethics of Jesus are utterly inseparable.

The God of Jesus differs fundamentally from the Jehovah presented in many sections of the Old Testament, where Yahweh is frequently pictured as authorizing pillage and slaughter and often as himself an active participant in war, as may be seen from the following passages:

"Thus saith Jehovah of hosts. . . . Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not, but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling. . . . Jehovah hath sworn: Jehovah will have war with Amalek from generation to generation. . . . He shall eat up the nations of his adversaries, and shall break their bones in pieces, and smite them through with his arrows. . . . My wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword. . . . Thou shalt give life for life. . . . Jehovah hath delivered your enemies the Moabites into your hand. . . . Jehovah cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: They were more who died with the hail-stones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword. . . . And I myself will fight against you with an outstretched hand and with a strong arm, even in anger and in wrath, and in great indignation. . . . For behold, I will send serpents, adders, among you, which

will not be charmed; and they shall bite you, saith Jehovah. . . . I will consume them by the sword, and by famine, and by the pestilence. . . . And their dead bodies shall be food unto the birds of the heavens, and to the beasts of the earth . . . yes I trod them in mine anger, and trampled them in my wrath; and their lifeblood is sprinkled upon my garments."

Literally hundreds of passages of this character could be cited. An authoritative study of this whole question was published recently as a doctor's thesis at Teachers College, Columbia University, under the title, *The God of the Old Testament in Relation to War*. The major conclusion of the author, Dr. Marion J. Benedict, is summarized as follows: "Yahweh has been found to be a God of war throughout most of the Old Testament material. In fact, the book of Ruth is practically the only entire document in which Yahweh is not directly or indirectly associated with warfare." Here and there are to be found notable exceptions to this view, chiefly in Amos, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jonah, and Isaiah 19: 18-25. But these exceptions only serve to emphasize the all but universal idea that Yahweh was a god of war.

The teaching of Jesus concerning eternal punishment is often regarded as picturing God in the form of a cruel judge. If Jesus really taught that sinners are doomed by God to burn throughout eternity in a literal lake of fire, then his God is not a loving heavenly Father. Certainly no affectionate human parent would treat a beloved child in this barbarous manner. It is utterly unthinkable that Jesus would himself condemn a wrongdoer to everlasting torture.

If he conceived of the Eternal in this image, then the God thus envisaged is a moral monstrosity. But is this the teaching of Jesus? It seems quite incredible. Moreover, it is by no means a necessary interpretation. Like any other Oriental teacher he spoke in parables and figurative language. Allowance must also be made for misinterpretations by the persons who recorded their impressions of his words. Jesus frequently pointed out the inevitable consequences of human conduct. It would be easy for his hearers to assume that he was uttering threats of punishment. When he refers to the suffering caused by the fires of Gehenna as analogous to the miseries produced by unfilial and antisocial conduct, it would not be difficult to interpret him as saying that God condemns the wicked to eternal fire, especially since the minds of his hearers were saturated with this idea. There is, however, a vast difference between consequence and punishment. When a child disregards his mother's warning and plays with fire the pain which he suffers is a consequence, not a punishment. The God of Jesus permits fire to burn; He does not throw his unruly children into a furnace. The Father of the prodigal son could never consign his child to eternal flames. The Good Shepherd could never torture the wandering sheep. It is not the will of your Father that one of his little ones should perish, much less be endlessly tortured.¹³

Since God is Father of all, there is only one family. Every human being is privileged and obliged to treat

¹³ Concerning this point see an illuminating discussion by Lily Dougal and C. W. Emmet, *The Lord of Thought*.

every other individual as a member of the household. Attitudes and practices that violate the spirit of the home should never be tolerated. No son should be guilty of blasphemy and irreverence. Indifference to His presence and disobedience to His wishes grieve the Father. Ingratitude is baseness itself.

Beware of covetousness. Greed wrecks the family. Avarice is so deadly that if a man cannot conquer it he must sell all that he has and give it to the poor. Pride and ostentation are disgusting; hypocrisy destroys fellowship; anxiety is a cancer; extortion and exploitation are out of place in the home; lust is a perversion and should be shunned. To seek physical thrills at the expense of another is to disregard the value of personality. Anger is poison. Hatred breaks the family bond. Revenge is never sought in a true home. Murder of a beloved kinsman is unthinkable. Woe unto the man who causes his brother to stumble or drags him through the mire. To wreck the personality of a fellow man is worse than to drown one's own body in the deep sea.

The home is a place of affection. Understanding is sought, sympathy prevails, kindness is manifested. Mutual forbearance is the rule; patience is exhibited; forgiveness brings reconciliation. Everyone delights in serving the others. Sacrifice is joyously accepted. The welfare of the group takes precedence over the desires of any member. The one increasing purpose of life is the creation of the Family of God. This is the pearl of great price. In order to secure it a man will eagerly sell all he has. This treasure will be sought until it is found. Any person who turns back from this

adventure is an unworthy member of the home. No distraction should be permitted to interfere or obstruct. The desire for comfort, privilege, prestige, or safety must not be allowed to stand in the way. What good will it do if a man gain many possessions and lose his zeal for fellowship? The deceitfulness of riches has ensnared many an unwary traveller. Rather than be paralyzed by desire, one must pluck out an eye or amputate an arm. It is better to continue the pursuit maimed and blind than to be swerved by fleshpots. He that endures to the end will be victorious.

Difficulties and perils abound along the pathway that leads toward the Family of God. The road is very narrow and only a few ever find it. High barriers must be surmounted, deep rivers must be crossed, many dangers must be confronted. The roadway is infested with evil doers—persons who, because of ignorance, delusion, prejudices, desire, greed, passion, or disease, are a menace to their relatives. The man who fell among thieves on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho is only one of an innumerable host.

The way to overcome evil is by doing good. To do good is to live every day as a true member of the home. Turn away from those attitudes and practices which destroy the family. Exhibit those virtues which constitute the foundations of the home. Remember that the wrongdoer is a child of God, of inestimable inherent worth, and, therefore, should be treated with reverence and affection. Can the use of physical force ever be reconciled with the family spirit? No explicit answer is found in the words of Jesus. On one

occasion he appears to have resorted to force himself, although the American Revised Version makes it quite clear that he did not use the cord on the men: "And he made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, *both* the sheep and the oxen; *and* he poured out the changers' money, and overthrew their tables."¹⁴ The most that can be gotten out of this incident is that Jesus justifies the use of force. It sheds no light upon the question as to whether the taking of life, capital punishment, or war are ever justifiable. The criterion by which Jesus judges every method is this: Can it be used appropriately in the home? As to whether restraint is permissible, that all depends. If used in the spirit of love, for the good of the wrongdoer and with due regard for his personality, as well as for the protection of the other members of family, coercion may be justifiable.

Those persons who do not think of life in terms of the Family of God often feel justified, however, in defending themselves by torture and terror. Long has it been the practice, ever since men became sufficiently humane to restrict unlimited retaliation, to exact an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life. This is justice. But an enduring home can never be founded on justice alone. Love, mercy, forgiveness, and sacrifice are likewise indispensable.

¹⁴Moffatt translates this passage as follows: "Making a scourge of cords, he drove them all, sheep and oxen together, out of the temple, scattered the coins of the brokers and upset their tables." While Goodspeed reads: "And he made a lash out of rope, and drove them all, sheep and cattle, out of the Temple, and scattered the money-changers' coins on the ground, and overturned their tables." Weymouth phrases it: "So He plaited a whip of rushes and drove all—both sheep and bullocks—out of the Temple. The small coin of the brokers He upset on the ground and overturned their tables."

The old law of revenge must be supplanted by practices which are appropriate in the home. Pay back no one evil for evil. Instead of returning blow for blow, indicate a new temper by offering the other cheek. Reveal a complete absence of resentment and hostility by going the second mile. Love even your enemies. They are your kinsmen. Do them good, bless them, pray for them, forgive them seventy times seven. Love and forgiveness are means; ways of awakening the latent goodness in the wrongdoer. By not insisting upon its rights, love reveals a far better method. Love never fails. If it is patient and kind it penetrates even the most hardened heart. The body may be killed but love can never die. It is life. On love hangs the law, the prophets, the gospel, all life.

Love must never be abandoned or it will fail. It is not enough to love when love is easy. Even pagans do as much. Love when love is most needed; when it is difficult and dangerous; when blood is hot and passions are aroused. Love without fear of consequences. Never be afraid. Fear is a foul spirit. Cast it out. Be not unduly concerned about appetites or sensations, comfort or safety. Pain may come, but what of it? When voluntarily assumed on behalf of a brother beloved, suffering is the gateway to joy and to life. The most precious of all privileges is fellowship in suffering; with God and for one's brethren. So be not afraid. What abiding difference does it make if your property is destroyed? Life does not consist of things. You may be falsely accused of every evil practice, but are your satisfactions at the mercy

of every traducer? Suppose you are persecuted. This was the reward meted out to the prophets before you. Find joy in overcoming your assailant with love. Even if your body is killed, love does not perish. Love is like a grain of wheat. Its harvest comes after it has been buried. So be not dismayed because men think it God's will that you be put to death. Even if you are devoured as a lamb by wolves, love lives on. And love is life. He that loves to the end never dies.

It seems incredible that a man with such a message and such nobility of character should have been killed as an enemy of society. But is it surprising? Has not this sort of thing been done in every age? Before and since Calvary? In a memorable passage Jesus refers to the fact that it is customary for one generation to stone the prophets and for another to erect monuments in their honour.

3. WHY WAS JESUS KILLED?¹⁵

Five age-old factors combined to bring about the death of Jesus: blindness, bigotry, fear, self-centredness, and indifference. "They do not know what they are doing," Jesus is reported to have said in his prayer of forgiveness on the cross. Those persons who were responsible for his tragic death had only the faintest understanding of what he was seeking to accomplish. Even his own disciples so completely misinterpreted his teaching that at the very end they argued among themselves as to who should have the chief places. So little had they understood what he

¹⁵ Case, *op. cit.*, pp. 293 ff.; Dickey, *op. cit.*, 39 ff., 85 ff.

had said about the nature of the Kingdom that they still visualized twelve thrones of solid gold and quarrelled among themselves over the seats of honour on the right and left of the king. When Jesus talked of suffering and death they thought he was out of his mind. Sorrowfully Jesus reproached Peter because his outlook was not that of God but of man. Even the chosen three had such a faint realization of what was going on in his mind that they could not so much as keep awake while he agonized in Gethsemane. Yet they had lived in intimate fellowship with him, were passionately devoted to him, and were ready to die for him. Truly he had many things to say which they were never able to comprehend or to bear.

How much less able to fathom the meaning of his words and deeds were the ecclesiastical leaders. Sympathy is always necessary to true insight. Bitterness and hostility constitute an insurmountable barrier to understanding. No wonder the scribes and Pharisees thought that Jesus was possessed by Beelzebub and that he drove out demons by the help of the prince of devils. From their point of view he acted like a madman.

The blindness of the religious authorities was intensified by their bigotry. Like other ecclesiastics who preceded them and those who followed after, they were sure that they were the custodians of truth and righteousness. "Thank God I am not like other men," has ever been the cry of bigots. That they could be mistaken in any major conclusion had never occurred to them. "The notion of progressive revelation," says Professor George Foot Moore, "was im-

possible; the revelation to Moses was complete and final; no other prophet should ever make any innovation in the law. . . . The law, being perfect, is unchangeable." And so Jesus was convicted of blasphemy. Who was this young upstart who talked so freely of God and spoke as one having authority? At the feet of what eminent teacher had he ever sat? Merely a carpenter! From Nazareth, too! What could one expect from a provincial village workman? Imagine such an unlettered prophet seeking to instruct and admonish the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of New York! Or even the minister of Old First Church! His contemporaries thought that he was possessed of an evil spirit. Succeeding generations have phrased it differently.

Blind bigots are always afraid; afraid that the sacred ark will be destroyed; afraid the institution will be undermined. And so those who sat in the seats of authority were genuinely alarmed lest Jesus should lead the people astray. On four separate counts they pronounced him a dangerous character. In the first place, Jesus was a radical on race questions. He treated men of every colour and tongue as sons of a common Father and therefore brothers beloved. He taught that God does not discriminate against any person because of racial heritage. In His sight all men are of inherent and inestimable value. The Jews of that day, however, were so sure that they were God's chosen people and were so arrogant and proud that they refused to have any dealings with the Samaritans. The sensation that would be created in a Southern community if a white man

should invite a Negro to dine with him is somewhat comparable with the furore produced within the ranks of orthodox Jews by the practices of Jesus. In their eyes he was a renegade.

Jesus also disregarded the rigid class lines of his day. The Jewish leaders looked with contempt on the rabble. If they accidentally came into physical contact with a person who was ceremonially unclean they felt obliged to undergo an elaborate process of purification. Certain groups were wholly outside the pale. No self-respecting Jew would mingle on terms of equality with tax collectors. And as for courtesans, no decent person would associate with them—publicly. Hypocrisy has usually prevailed in the treatment accorded prostitutes. Under the Jewish law these disreputable women were worthy of death by stoning. But when Jesus suggested to the accusers of a certain woman that the man who was without guilt should cast the first stone, one by one they slunk away. No wonder the Jewish leaders were infuriated at the sight of Jesus mingling freely with all classes of people, completely ignoring the social cleavages of the day, and teaching that every human being is of priceless worth, with Godlike potentialities.

Another serious charge against Jesus was that he threatened to undermine the foundations upon which the contemporary ecclesiastical organization rested.¹⁶ The authorities had reason to be afraid. If Jesus succeeded in winning the people to his religion the whole ceremonial and sacrificial system would be swept away. Nothing more terrifying than this could

¹⁶Murry, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-87.

possibly be imagined by devout Jews who regarded the law as God-given and absolutely essential to salvation. And so with entire sincerity the Pharisees were alarmed lest Jesus should lead the people astray. In this attitude they were not hypocrites or fools or villains; they were simply zealous and apprehensive churchmen, determined to safeguard the divine institution intrusted to their care. The orthodox Fundamentalist of our day is less afraid of the heresies of the Modernist than the religious contemporaries of Jesus were terrified by his doctrines and practices. And like their predecessors and their successors, they were utterly ruthless when the sacred institution was threatened. Better that one man should die than that the people should perish in darkness and wickedness.

Still another serious charge against Jesus was that of treason to his country. His admonition to refrain from hatred and retaliation and instead to love the Romans seemed to the patriots of the day nothing less than disloyalty and treachery to his native land, groaning as it was under the heel of the alien conqueror. It requires little imagination to describe the reception that would have been accorded a Belgian teacher in 1915 if he had urged his countrymen to refrain from ill will toward the Germans and to treat them with kindness and affection. There is little doubt as to what would have happened to an American citizen early in 1918 if he had arisen in a Liberty Loan mass meeting and pleaded for the immediate cessation of hostilities and protested against the hatred being manifested toward the Germans. Well,

the emotional responses of Belgians and Americans when confronted with the German menace were less intense and explosive than were the feelings of loyal Jews in the days of Jesus. One hundred per cent. patriots in every land should find it easy to understand why the Jews chose Barabbas and crucified Jesus.

The fourth important factor in the situation was that the Jewish leaders, especially the Sadducees, had a stake in the maintenance of the status quo. Vested interests were involved. Profits and prestige were threatened. Jesus was undermining the standing and influence of the Pharisees and Sadducees. His attacks on the Temple practices touched their purse strings. Indeed, what would become of the whole sacrificial system if he were allowed to continue his dangerous activities? The end would be nothing less than the abandonment of the law of Moses. The threatened loss of privilege and power increased the zeal of the ecclesiastical authorities for the law and the institution. Moreover, experience had shown that sooner or later fanatics got into trouble with the Romans. Quite likely Jesus would stir up a riot or rebellion for which the Jewish leaders would be held responsible. The risk was too great.

Herod and Pilate likewise had a stake in the existing order. They were hired men of Rome and their tenure of office depended upon their ability to preserve the peace. Either of these rulers could have saved Jesus from crucifixion, but neither was willing to run the risks. Pilate seems to have been genuinely convinced that Jesus was innocent and made a feeble

effort to release him. But when the crafty accusers of Jesus reminded him of the probable consequences of releasing a prisoner charged with sedition, he quickly washed his hands of the whole affair. Few politicians have ever been willing to endanger their own standing in order to render justice to a friendless prisoner at the bar. Personal prestige and power were of more importance to Pilate than the life of a prisoner. And as for Herod, he was ruthless in disposing of those who threatened his pleasure or security. He did not even respect the sanctity of his brother's home. What could be expected from one who had already proved himself heartless in beheading John? Herod may have thought Jesus innocent but he saw a chance to gain the good will of Pilate by a generous gesture in yielding jurisdiction over the case. The record says that these selfish cowards became friends that day. To this extent will self-centredness lead a man, that he will trade the blood of innocent victims for personal advantage.

And so Jews and Romans alike were guilty of sacrificing Jesus for the sake of comfort and safety. And it is always easy to identify individual privilege with the general good and to imagine that one is battling on behalf of society when in fact the struggle is for private gain. When the pious slave owner assailed the abolitionist he readily convinced himself that he was doing so on behalf of a noble cause. When the devout rich man bitterly attacks radicalism he sincerely believes that he is manifesting zeal on behalf of the masses of people, whereas in reality his primary concern may be for the preservation of his

own unearned income. Self-deception is as old as mankind. Conscientiousness is no guarantee of moral conduct.

Indifference constituted a fifth major reason why Jesus was killed. Powerful groups were arrayed against him, but only a few sought to defend him. The fickle crowds melted away when it became apparent that Jesus was not the long-expected Deliverer. His ethical demands were too exacting to gain for him a large following. During the days of supreme crisis only a few score individuals, at most, cared enough to exert themselves on his behalf. Christians have long imagined that all of Jerusalem was in turmoil when Jesus was crucified. It is probably much nearer the truth to say that this tragic event went unnoticed by the great mass of the people. Populations have usually been indifferent to the fate of martyrs. Loneliness has ever been the lot of those who were ahead of their day. The citizens of Jerusalem probably gave no more attention to the execution of the Great Teacher than the people of an American city ordinarily give to the hanging of a common criminal.

Blindness, bigotry, fear, self-centredness, indifference—this deadly quintette did its work well. And so they cried, "Crucify him, crucify him. Release unto us Barabbas"; Barabbas who was taken in sedition; Barabbas the revolutionist who had killed an officer of the law; Barabbas who sought freedom by the sword; Barabbas the patriot. Release him. But crucify Jesus; Jesus who went about doing good; Jesus who urged them to seek the Family of God;

Jesus who admonished them to love the Romans; Jesus who offered them freedom indeed. Crucify him. And their shouting won. Barabbas was released and Jesus nailed to a cross.

4. THE MEANING OF THE CROSS¹⁷

Jesus went to his doom because of the irreconcilable conflict between his way of life and that of his contemporaries. Wherever blindness, bigotry, fear, self-centredness, and indifference prevail, there will those who seek to live as if the Family of God is a present reality suffer abuse and persecution from defenders of the established order. Society always issues an ultimatum to the innovator; conform to this world or expect the reward of a heretic or a traitor. Every generation metes out substantially the same punishment to those who fall far below and those who rise high above its standards. Thieves and prophets of a new day rot in the same foul dungeon; murderers and the Saviour of mankind agonize on adjacent crosses.

At every stage Jesus was confronted with the necessity of choosing. Throughout the silent years, in the wilderness after baptism, at Cæsarea Philippi, in the garden of Gethsemane, he wrestled with the problem. More and more clearly he saw the vast gulf between his ideal and the practices of those about him. In moments of exaltation he caught a vision of life as it ought to be and might be. And

¹⁷Edward Grubb, *The Meaning of the Cross and Christianity as Life*; J. A. Robertson, *The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Jesus*; George Stewart, *Redemption: An Anthology of the Cross*.

then he would see the greed and cruelty, the barrenness and misery, of those about him. Swept by infinite tenderness and boundless compassion, he spent long days and nights seeking the way out. From each succeeding experience of communion with God the conviction became more intense that love alone can bring reconciliation between man and man and between man and God. When measured by the ideals of the universal home, the solutions proposed by Essenes, Sadducees, Pharisees, and Zealots were recognized as tragically inadequate.

Not by fleeing from society can mankind be redeemed. Asceticism may offer a way of escape from the temptations that come from association with one's fellows and bring a sense of release and contentment. But the universal family can never be built by hermits. Contact may lead to contamination, but it is essential to redemption. Love never flees from the object of its affection. Where pain is most severe and sorrow most bitter, there love is most solicitous and untiring. The heart that broods over Jerusalem can never tarry long in the desert.

Not by conforming to this world can humanity be saved. Lying down in the gutter with the derelict is no way to reform him. Acquiescence is not an effective method of remedying evils. Sharing the gains of exploitation and enjoying privileges arising out of injustice will never lead to the transformation of society. Untiring opposition to false standards and ceaseless activity against wrongdoing are demanded by love. Mankind can never be lifted to the highest levels if its teachers dwell in the lowlands. To be in

the world and yet not of it is the difficult requirement of love.

Not by observing the law can fulness of life be attained. In spite of a noble concept of a holy God and a highly developed ethical sensitiveness, the emphasis of the Pharisees was often upon the letter of the law. The running sores of mankind can never be cured by scrupulously observing feast days and fast days. Haunting fears are not driven away by abstaining from unclean food. Ghastly memories of sordid deeds are not effaced by giving tithes of all that a man has. The aching void of sorrow and misery can never be filled by strict observance of the Sabbath. Hostility and enmity cannot be removed by sacrifices of rams and goats. The maladies that afflict humanity are too deadly to be cured by ceremony and ritual. The letter kills, only love gives life.

Not by using the weapons of Satan can the spirit of evil be cast out. Hatred is not an effective instrument for removing hatred. Desire for revenge does not promote the family spirit. Violence and terror are not appropriate weapons in the home. They that take the sword shall perish thereby. Real freedom is from within. More important than deliverance from political bondage is release from paralyzing emotion. *It is better to be enslaved by Romans than by hatred.* Little is gained by an exchange of masters. Genuine freedom can be achieved only by living as a good member of God's home. Essene and harlot; Pharisee and publican; Sadducee and outcast; Zealot and centurion; Jew and Gentile; Roman and Samaritan; Greek and Syro-Phœnician—all are kinsmen.

No contempt, even for the courtesan; no discrimination, even against the Samaritan; no hatred, even of the tax gatherer; no hostility, even toward the Romans. Treat every person as a member of the family. Exhibit sympathy, kindness, affection, forgiveness. Meet the acid test: love the Roman, bless the conqueror, pray for the despoiler, do good to the exploiter, forgive the invader. Do unto the Romans as you would have God do unto you. If the son shall make you free you will be free indeed.

Early in his ministry and at the very end Jesus was confronted with the great choice. Immediately after the profound spiritual experience which accompanied his consecration in baptism, he was impelled to withdraw for a further period of reflection and communion before plunging into his public ministry. In the story of the temptations we catch a glimpse of the struggle that went on in his mind during those momentous days. Three alternatives kept recurring. Establish the Kingdom of God in one of three ways.

First, Jesus was tempted to concentrate upon a ministry of physical healing. Poverty and suffering abounded on every side. Keenly sensitive to human pain and passionately desirous of relieving misery, he turned in his mind to this solution again and again. Why not command the stones to become bread so that the hungry may be filled? The meaning of this temptation is lost to the literal minded. Stones and bread are symbols. Why not devote major energy to supplying the physical needs of people? Because man does not live by material things alone but by friend-

ship and communion. What shall it profit a man to have his stomach filled, as long as his mind is poisoned with hatred? What good will it do to drive away pain if the life is left empty? Seven other evil spirits are sure to enter and dwell therein, and the last state will be worse than the first. Bread is needed but far more than bread must be supplied. Men are starving for lack of comradeship with each other and are dying because of a dearth of fellowship with God. Nothing less than the bread of life and streams of living water can satisfy their craving. Love is what men require. Few temptations are more subtle and powerful than the suggestion to supplant the best with the good.

Second, Jesus was tempted to rely upon spectacular displays of power. That he possessed unique gifts he could not doubt. He had the strength of ten because his purpose was single. Days of loving ministry to fellow townsmen and nights of silent vigil with the Eternal had released in him the floods of power which in varying volume are dammed up within every child of God. The suggestion came that he validate his claim to a unique relation with God by a dramatic display. Leap from the pinnacle of the Temple and trust God to send guardian angels to bear him safely and triumphantly to the earth! By this mighty demonstration the populace would be convinced that the Messiah had come and would render him homage and obedience. The multitude always crave a sign. But Jesus was wise enough to realize that salvation does not come from marvel-mongers. Crowds throng about an adept magician but their sorrowing

hearts are left uncomfortable and their distressed minds are not set at ease. Serenity and vision emerge only from love.

The third temptation that came to Jesus was to gain power and prestige by making friends with the great ones of the earth. If only he would cultivate the Sadducees and the Romans he could climb to the seats of the mighty. There were no limits to the influence that might be wielded by one with such a magnetic personality and such qualities of leadership. The people were groaning beneath their burdens. Think of the opportunities for doing good! Perhaps he might even be able to lead his countrymen in a successful revolt against Rome and thus restore the ancient glories of David and Solomon. Judas Maccabeus had gained freedom for his people in the face of similar odds. God had promised! Perhaps—and what a thought it was!—perhaps he had been sent for such a purpose as this! For days the idea haunted Jesus. Otherwise there would have been no temptation. In the end he thrust the thought behind him. He saw what had happened to those who sat in the seats of authority and understood full well that redemption could never come from them. Reconciliation and fellowship flourish only in the atmosphere of love.

The record states that after the struggle in the wilderness the tempter left Jesus for a period. But never for long. The choice had to be made again and again. Each time it became more difficult. The way of love was proving to be increasingly dangerous. Finally it was necessary to withdraw for a time. At Cæsarea Philippi Jesus and the Twelve faced the

whole problem anew. Was it wise to go on? Was it worth while? In Gethsemane the struggle became still more acute. As was his custom when confronted with a supreme crisis, Jesus sought solitude. In the stillness of the night he listened to the voice of God. Never was his mind keener, never did his heart go out with a deeper yearning. The people were like sheep without a shepherd. Everywhere hunger and pain, envy and greed, cruelty and lust, hatred and strife, blasphemy and irreverence. As a hen shelters her brood under her wings, he would have drawn all men unto his way of love. But they would not come. The multitudes were utterly indifferent, the men of authority were bitterly hostile. His own loved ones did not understand, and as for his disciples, even in his hour of supreme need they were deep in slumber. The thought kept coming that perhaps he had been mistaken in his reliance on love. His passionate effort to build the Family of God seemed to be in vain. Why go on?

The one thing that seemed certain was his own approaching doom. Unmistakably clear was the evidence of implacable hostility on the part of the ecclesiastical leaders. Obsessed with hatred and fear, they regarded him as an enemy of God and the people and with conscientious zeal were plotting his speedy destruction. What good would be accomplished by going ahead? Why not placate his foes by necessary adjustments? They, too, were really seeking the reign of God. Would it not be wise to make the best of the prevailing situation, while clinging to the hope that the day will soon come when a mar. can

follow his ideals? Why throw away one's influence? Why forfeit the chance to continue doing good? Why court martyrdom? After all, a man must live. Surely it is not the will of God that an innocent man should die an ignominious death on the cross. No wonder that drops of blood stood out on his forehead. "If it be possible," he cried unto God, "if it be possible, save me from defeat and shame!"

In the darkness of the night two alternatives appeared before Jesus with the brilliance of the noon-day sun. Life or a way of life! He must choose. Live as his contemporaries lived or die. Blindness and intolerance and fear have always refused to permit a man to treat every other human being under every circumstance as a member of the family, worthy to be loved, forgiven, trusted. So the Jewish leaders gave Jesus his choice. Live as they lived or die.

Out of the black silence came light from the Eternal. A great quietness came over Jesus. It is the will of God that a man should faithfully follow the way of love. The purpose of life is to build the divine community. The way to create the ideal society is to live to-day as if it is already a reality. Live this hour as a good member of the Family of God. Depend upon love. Run the risks. Accept the consequences. Have confidence in God and faith in man. Rather than forsake the way of love it is better for a man to die.

Yet Jesus passionately longed to live. The theory that the crucifixion of Jesus was predestined and pre-ordained and that he went through life as a fated victim belies the facts. If literally interpreted this

theory transforms him into a mere automaton, which is unthinkable in the light of the record. Likewise, the theory that his death was required in order to appease the wrath of an angry God is repugnant. And the explanation that the Divine Law demands a purchase price to atone for the sins of mankind seems legalistic and artificial. Some say that Jesus deliberately provoked his crucifixion as the means of ushering in the Messianic age. There are many passages in the Gospels that seem to support this theory. New Testament scholars differ sharply concerning the extent to which Jesus was influenced by prevailing apocalyptic ideas. Some of those who have studied the documents most carefully have concluded that his entire life must be interpreted in the light of his expectation of the imminent coming of the Kingdom. It is frequently maintained that Jesus believed that his death would immediately usher in the new era. The critics are hopelessly divided as to the meaning of the phrase "Son of Man" which was so often upon his lips.

But in spite of all these perplexities, certain facts stand out clearly. Jesus frequently likened the coming of the Kingdom to the slow working of leaven and the steady growth of seed. He spoke constantly of the Kingdom as a present reality. The record shows that on several occasions he carefully avoided an open clash with the authorities that might have eventuated in his arrest. Very often the significance of his utterances was veiled in parables and stories. To the very end he struggled against his fate. The agony in Gethsemane was no stage performance. If it

be possible! If it be possible! From the cross itself came the cry: "My God, my God, why . . . ?"

Then why did Jesus make the last fatal journey to Jerusalem?¹⁸ Why did he not stay in Cæsarea Philippi where it was more difficult for the Pharisees to reach him? Why not turn his back upon blind and bigoted Judaism and devote himself to a ministry among Gentiles? Some consider this the third great temptation of Jesus. There is evidence to show that those who were regarded as outcasts and sinners by the Jewish leaders often responded more heartily to the appeal of Jesus than did orthodox devotees of the law. Self-righteousness, pride, and intolerance sometimes prove to be more formidable barriers to the Family of God than are constituted by greed, lust, and hatred. Why not go where there is the greatest response? Surely, at any rate, it is better to minister to foreigners than to be killed by one's own countrymen.

Yet Jesus set his face like flint toward Jerusalem. Why? The elapse of time and the meagreness of the record make complete understanding impossible. But the explanation that seems most historical and most satisfying is that Jesus responded to a deep inner urge, a divine call, to witness before his own people. Jesus was a uniquely sensitive mystic. In hours of prolonged communion the presence of God was more real to him than any human being could possibly be. He never doubted the nearness and accessibility of the Father, no matter how black the night. As to just what Jesus expected to accomplish

¹⁸See Murry, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-270.

by that last visit to Jerusalem we can only conjecture. But this much at least is clear: he had resolutely determined that at any cost he would faithfully follow the will of God.

Thoughts like these were probably in his mind. God never despairs nor does He ever forsake one of His children. It is not His will that even the least perfect should perish. Generation after generation had been compassed about with His affection. Never rebuffed by ingratitude nor blasphemy nor disobedience, God had pursued the Israelites with an undying love. Then, as Jesus brooded over the future, the clouds of perplexity and indecision were swept away by a vivid sense of the boundless mercy and passionate tenderness of the Eternal. He *must* go to Jerusalem. Even the probability of crucifixion could not deter him. In the Holy City he would live as if the Reign of God had already begun, revealing to all men their kinship with the Father and with each other. He would summon the people to love and forgiveness and fellowship. He would run the risk and endure the pain. The very heart of the Eternal would be revealed in his last effort. Then, if ever, men would come to themselves and return to the house of their Father. Love never fails when it is kind and persistent. There is no other way to create the ideal society. So Jesus went to his doom. The price demanded for life—disloyalty to God's purpose—was too great. Not for his own life but for the pearl of great price a man eagerly sells all that he has—possessions, talents, strength, blood!

What, then, is the meaning of the Cross? Just

because we are here confronted with the bravest and noblest and purest of lives we cannot fully comprehend the significance of his sublime gift. Christendom has obscured the meaning of this supreme act of history by a hundred fine-spun theories, some of them horrible and revolting. But here, if anywhere, we find a clue to the meaning of the universe. In the light of the Cross three momentous facts stand revealed: the awful consequences of estrangement and strife, the redeeming power of sacrificial love, the deepest joy and the fullest self-realization come only through self-renunciation.

The awful chasm between goodness and evil, between righteousness and unrighteousness, nowhere stands out in such stark reality as in the presence of the Cross. Light is snuffed out by darkness. Love is done to death by hate. Forgiveness is met with malignity. Sacrifice is rewarded with ignominy. God's home is transformed into a charnel house. The appalling need of the human heart is exposed. Created in the spiritual image of God and capable of rising to sublime heights, man is also able to sink below the level of the beast. Blindness that cannot distinguish holiness from heresy, bigotry that confuses tradition with truth, hypocrisy that counterfeits the coin of sincerity, greed that devours a widow's substance, lust that feeds on a woman's body, fear that nails innocence to a tree—all these are horrible realities. The bestialities of human nature must be taken into account.

At the foot of the Cross, how pitifully inadequate appear the programmes of Jesus' contemporaries.

The offer of salvation through ceremonial and ritual is sheer mockery. Compromise with temporal powers can never lead to redemption. Flight to ascetic communities cannot heal the festering sores of society. Resort to violence merely compounds fear and hatred. Prodigal sons can never be persuaded to reclaim their heritage, nor can embittered brethren be reconciled, except by an inner change of heart. The fathomless gulf that separated men from God and from each other can be bridged only by love and fellowship.

The Cross of Calvary reveals God's way of creating the universal home. Here we catch a glimpse of the faith and daring of the Eternal. To create man with a measure of freedom required sublime trust and indomitable courage because freedom means power to choose evil. And unwise decisions lead to suffering. The harvest is always determined by the sowing. Freedom may lead to estrangement, to callousness, to misery. A great venture of faith was necessary before such power was placed in the hands of immature and imperfect children. Freedom might even lead to disaster. And at Golgotha it seemed to have ended in defeat. But this was only an illusion because sacrificial love is never defeated. Victory is inherent in the Cross. When a grain of wheat falls in the earth and dies it yields a rich harvest. The seed may appear to be dead, but not so; it is only buried. First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. First the Cross, then resurrection, then redemption.

That Jesus was annihilated on the Cross is to me

simply unthinkable. The universe in which we live conserves values. Science tells us that matter or energy is imperishable; many changes of form but no annihilation. What a meaningless world it would be if lesser values should be preserved with infinite care while the noblest creation of the ages alone is destroyed! To me belief in the resurrection of man is absolutely essential to rational thought. And that one who was so altogether lovely and Godlike should utterly perish is simply beyond my comprehension. The rationality of God is at stake. If death is the end for man, then it is difficult to believe that intelligence and love are at the heart of the universe. If there is no God then the life of Jesus is the most ghastly delusion of history. It would indeed be an irrational universe if a tragic hallucination should create the fairest flower of the human race.

Just how does the death of Jesus bring salvation? That the blood of Christ is essential to redemption has been the deepest conviction of Christendom in every age. Few Christians, however, have ever had any clear idea as to why the Cross is necessary to salvation or how atonement is wrought by the shedding of blood. Salvation itself has usually been thought of as escape from hell and entrance into heaven. Numerous theories have been advanced as to how belief in the blood of the Lamb saves from eternal damnation, many of which are repugnant to ethical minds to-day. Some have said that a ransom must be paid to Satan; some that the payment of a great price was necessary in order to placate an angry God; some that divine justice could not forgive

unless a perfect sacrifice was offered for the sins of mankind; while multitudes of humble folk have made no effort to explain the mystery, simply imputing magical power to the shed blood of Calvary.

Let us not conclude, however, that since many explanations are inadequate or revolting, there is no redemption in the Cross. Salvation is not release from future punishment or the enjoyment of eternal bliss. Salvation is reconciliation and appreciation; reconciliation with God and man; appreciation of the good, the true, and the beautiful. A man is saved when he shuns unfilial and antisocial attitudes and practices; when he exhibits the virtues of the home. Salvation is not an act; it is a process. We are not saved, we are being saved. We grow into redemption. Death is not the end of life; it is merely the dividing line between two aspects of one reality. Life itself is continuous and eternal. Day by day we are being saved or being lost. After death we go right on from where we were. The direction we take is determined by the quality of our unconscious conduct. If we give food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, welcome to the stranger, clothes to the naked, relief to the sick, kindness to the prisoner, we are being saved. When we fail to live as if the Family of God is a present reality we are being lost.

Now it is easier to understand how Jesus saves us. He makes us conscious of the presence of a loving Father and fills us with desire for unbroken fellowship with the Eternal. When near the Cross it is clear that estrangement from God and hostility toward His purposes lead to barrenness of life and

desolation of spirit. When confronted with Jesus, we cannot fail to see the importance of right decisions, nor can we overlook the terrible consequences of the lower forms of self-gratification—greed, lust, pride, enmity, retaliation. He exhibits a character of sheer nobility and utter loveliness and illustrates how compassion and devotion deal with fear and hate. By fathomless love and unstinting forgiveness he creates penitence and aspiration. Zacchæus found it impossible to practise fraud any longer. The sinful woman loathed her former ways after she had listened to him. Strength went from him into the withered limbs of the paralytic. The bereaved found comfort in his presence.

But how are we saved by the death of Jesus? Partly by the fact that the Cross produces repentance, longing, and determination; and partly because this change of heart makes it possible for God to help us in ways which were not available as long as we were alienated. The father of the prodigal passionately desired to do many things which were impossible as long as his son stayed in a far country and was unfilial in his conduct. It is blasphemy to say that the death of Christ was necessary in order to appease the wrath of an angry deity, for God is at least as loving and forgiving as was Jesus. The Cross does not make any difference in God's attitude toward us, but by bringing us to ourselves and prompting us to return to our Father's house it opens up new channels through which He can give light and power and joy.

And there is still another way in which Jesus saves us. By his living presence he constantly challenges us

to nobler conduct, encourages us in hours of depression, strengthens us in moments of weakness, and lifts us up when we have fallen. This conviction rests, of course, upon belief in immortality and the reality of the spiritual world. If God is a person, that is, has the ability to think and feel and act, and if we are persons in exactly the same sense, the only difference being that between a parent and an infant, then communication must be possible between God and ourselves. If death does not end life but only opens up new and higher possibilities, why should it be considered impossible for one who has gone on ahead to communicate with those who are struggling along behind? The greatest discoveries of the coming decades will undoubtedly be in the realm of personality. Already it has been demonstrated that under favourable conditions it is possible for mind to communicate with mind directly, without the use of external devices. Thought transference seems to have been scientifically established. And as for psychical research, while it is true that many scientists are skeptical concerning its possibilities, others equally eminent are convinced that the results thus far attained furnish the foundation for a valid hope for epoch-making discoveries in the near future.

The chief impression that we get from the records of Jesus' life is that he was so high above his contemporaries in the quality of his character and conduct as to be in a class by himself. So profoundly impressed were the early disciples that in spite of the fact that they were rigid monotheists, they regarded Jesus as having a unique relationship with God. Even

on a basis of the lowest possible estimate, he was an extraordinary individual with amazing vitality. Now if life is continuous and death only opens up illimitable opportunities for more complete living, and if mind can communicate with mind, why should it be regarded as impossible for Jesus to be in constant communication with those who are in tune with his spirit? The record of history bears important testimony concerning this point. Multitudes of Christians in every age and in all lands, including many of the keenest minds and most consecrated spirits, have been dominated by the certain conviction that the living presence of Christ was the greatest power in their lives.

This is the way Jesus saves us: by revealing the nature of God and creating within us the desire for fellowship with Him; by exhibiting life as it ought to be and may be and thus inspiring us to nobler conduct; by showing the hideous results of estrangement and enmity and by producing penitence and aspiration; by creating a consciousness of God's forgiveness and loving concern; and by prompting us day by day to higher thinking and more courageous living.

But Jesus can never save us unless we are ready to coöperate. Every person has the power to shut him out and to ignore his offer of salvation. And coöperation does not mean merely confessing with our lips that we believe in him. Complete dedication of self to his purposes and utter reliance upon his way of love are essential to salvation. This means the willingness to run risks and accept consequences. In a

world of blindness and fear, bigotry and selfishness, sacrifice is essential to salvation. If Jesus had turned back from the Cross he would have had no salvation to offer. Indeed, his name would hardly have been preserved in the records of history. Without the shedding of blood there is no redemption. This is a law of life as inexorable as any law in physics or chemistry. Even in the animal world, those species have survived and progressed which have practised mutual aid and self-sacrifice. The evolution of mankind is one long story of struggle and renunciation. An incalculable debt is due to the pioneers and heretics who, with indomitable courage and supreme abandon, have blazed new pathways to freedom and life.

The Cross of Calvary represents the highest pinnacle of human achievement. But it is not alone, nor is it enough. Many crosses are necessary to the redemption of mankind. This fact was emphasized by Jesus again and again. If any man would come after the Great Leader he must deny himself, take up his cross, and follow on. He that puts his hand to the plough and then turns back is unworthy. A man must be willing even to forsake father and mother if necessary in order to follow his ideals. He that truly desires to serve his fellows must not be content to deny himself certain coveted things; he must deny *himself*.

And this leads naturally to a consideration of the third meaning of the Cross; the deepest joy and the fullest self-realization come only through self-renunciation. Man is made in the spiritual image of

the Creator and is capable of rising Godward. By nature he is equipped to live in the home. Sympathy and kindness, affection and forgiveness, sharing and sacrifice, are natural and normal. Without the virtues of the family a man cannot be himself. Of course, he can live as an alien or an enemy or a beast. It is easily possible for him to wander into a far country and there devour his substance in riotous living. He may show base ingratitude toward his Father, or exhibit jealousy and enmity toward his brothers. Passion may make him inconsiderate and cruel. Loss of self-control through anger or hatred may cause him to mutilate or kill his fellows. But man at his best rises above these baser desires and more primitive urges.

When in a normal condition man derives more satisfaction from feeding those who are hungry than from gorging himself with dainty delicacies. Sublimation of a low desire for the sake of fellowship or the welfare of another is better than gratification. A parent who voluntarily endures pain on behalf of a child dwells on a higher level than the one who inflicts cruel punishment. Forgiveness is more rewarding than retaliation. Love toward an enemy is more satisfying than hatred can ever be. Self-sacrifice is natural for beast and man.

And so if an individual really wants to be his best self, he must live every day as if the Family of God is a present reality, turning away from any attitude of action that endangers the family bond and exhibiting always the true spirit of the home. If devotion to ideals leads to pain, then suffering be-

comes a gateway to joy and self-realization. The truth of this statement is revealed in the lives of the great spiritual leaders of the human race. Choose the men and women of history who impress you most with the nobility of their characters and you will find that with them dedication to a great cause took precedence over gratification of fleshly desires. Reflect upon the lives of those persons whom you rank highest and you will be reminded that they are not self-centred.

At every turn we come face to face with a paradox but none more startling than this: if a man seeks to save his life he loses it, but if he loses himself in devotion to a noble ideal he finds life indeed. With profound insight Jesus pointed out this fact to his disciples on many occasions. After repeated warnings that the end of his life was near, he had a last long conversation with his disciples shortly before his arrest. On this occasion he again told them that he was about to be killed and they would be scattered. He then went on to speak of joy through pain. The spirit of Jesus is truly reflected in the following words from John's Gospel: "These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy may be in you, and that your joy may be fulfilled. . . . These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In the world ye have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." Rejection and persecution and suffering; yet peace and joy and power.

Jesus never could have attained to such a Godlike character if he had turned back from the Cross. If he had been unwilling to endure suffering, the

latent power within him would never have been utilized. The rarest fellowship with God would have been denied him if he had put self above ideals. If he had sought comfort and safety he never could have become the world's Saviour. Verily life is lost in seeking and found in renunciation.

No man understands the full meaning of the Cross. We know too little of God and of life to comprehend clearly the significance of this supreme event of all time. But at least this we do know: the Cross reveals the hideousness of sin, releases the redeeming power of sacrificial love, and opens the gateway to abounding joy and complete self-realization. Here we find the answer to the supreme needs of every generation: how to overcome evil and build the divine society, and how to find happiness and serenity.

If any man would come, let him renounce self, follow the way of love, and live every day as a good member of God's home. The pathway may lead to persecution and suffering and seeming defeat, but it alone leads to reconciliation and redemption and life. This is the religion of Jesus.

CHAPTER II

CAUSES OF THE RAPID EXPANSION OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

IF IT had not actually happened it would be regarded as utterly impossible. That the religion of an obscure teacher in a conquered province, who himself was crucified as a common malefactor, should spread within three centuries, in spite of vigorous opposition and bitter persecution, so rapidly that it became the official religion of the mightiest empire of all the earth: this is simply incredible.

There seem to have been eight principal reasons for the phenomenal growth of early Christianity: the conviction that Jesus had risen from the grave and the expectation of his early bodily return; the preaching of a gospel of salvation in a decaying world; the practice of love and sharing; personal purity and family loyalty; the rejection of violence and war; the exhibition of unbounded courage and sacrificial devotion; the solidarity and discipline of the Christian fellowship; and, eventually, compromise with prevailing beliefs and practices.¹

¹See C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*; Adolf Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*; Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 1, Chap. 15.

I. EXPECTATION OF THE BODILY RETURN OF JESUS

Without confidence in the resurrection of Jesus there would have been no Christianity. The crucifixion had utterly crushed the disciples. To the very end they had expected Jesus to set up an earthly kingdom and when he was shamefully put to death as a criminal, all their hopes collapsed. Sorrowfully they prepared to take up their former life. And then came the news that Jesus had risen from the tomb. Some were incredulous at first, but when the conviction became general that he had broken the bonds of death and had ascended into heaven, one of the most amazing transformations in history took place. No longer gloomy and despairing, the disciples became joyous and hopeful; no longer fearful and afraid, they became bold and daring.

The early Christians not only felt certain that Jesus was alive, daily they awaited his bodily return in order to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. This great event was to occur during the lifetime of that generation² and would be followed by the resurrection of the dead and the judgment day. So confidently did they hold to this conviction that they joyously endured incredible hardships. "For I consider what we suffer now not to be compared with the glory that is to burst upon us. So I never lose heart, though my outer nature is wasting away my inner is being renewed every day. For this slight momentary trouble is piling up for me an eternal

²See Phil. 4:5; Heb. 10:25, 37; Acts 1:11; I Thess. 4:13-18; 5:4, 10; I Cor. 1:7; Phil. 3:20; I Tim. 6:14; I Peter 1:5; 4:17.

blessedness beyond all comparison. If you are being abused for the sake of Christ, you are blessed, because the glorious Spirit of God is resting upon you." These are characteristic words. Without this conviction and hope they would never have been able to overcome the terrific odds against them. As years passed the expectation of the speedy consummation of their dream became less vivid but it was never abandoned. In his early letters Paul expressed the conviction that Jesus would return during the lifetime of that generation, while in his later epistles he had become reconciled to the probability that the great day would not come until after his own death. While the Gospel of John, which came very late, seems to have spiritualized the second coming and no longer expected the bodily return of Jesus.

2. A GOSPEL OF SALVATION

The early Christian went about preaching a gospel of salvation in a decaying world: deliverance from the flesh, the tyranny of demons, and the grave; and entrance into an eternal life of joy and bliss. Those who would believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, openly confess his name and be baptized could escape the awful fate of the damned and receive the reward of the blessed. This message fell upon the eager ears of a generation that was looking everywhere for release and redemption.

The evils of that age have doubtless been greatly exaggerated and the more favourable factors underestimated. But after due allowance has been made,

the fact remains that there was an appalling amount of misery and injustice throughout the regions where the expansion of Christianity was most rapid. Greek and Roman civilizations rested upon the corner stone of slavery. The upper classes of that day saw no more harm in owning slaves than our contemporaries do in having hired servants. The master had power of life and death over the slave and could torture, maim, and crucify. Tacitus records the slaying of six hundred slaves because their master had been assassinated. Pollio was known to have amused himself by feeding his fish with the mutilated bodies of slaves. The wise and benevolent Marcus Aurelius classed slaves with animals. Seneca tells of a master who counted the roll of his slaves as a general counts his soldiers. The total number of slaves in the Roman Empire is unknown but has been estimated as high as sixty millions.³

This vast supply of slave labour greatly reduced rates of wages and regularity of employment of free workers. The cities, like powerful magnets, were drawing great numbers of rural people within their boundaries. Agriculture was on the down grade. Exorbitant taxes were required in order to meet the mounting costs of the empire. The workers were controlled absolutely by the employers and the government. Strikes were rare for the obvious reason that they had little chance of success when confronted with an inexhaustible supply of slave labour. The mass of people everywhere lived in the depths of degradation and misery. The free distribution of food

³See S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity*, p. 38.

by the government was a common phenomenon during this period, but even this measure was not sufficient to prevent widespread starvation. One writer has expressed the opinion that in no other era of history were so many human beings exposed to such bitter poverty as during these three centuries.⁴

Cruelty seems to have been deeply ingrained in the life of that age. Century after century of war and the brutalizing effects of slavery had made men callous to human suffering. Even their sports were bloody and barbarous. For the incredibly long period of nearly seven hundred years, from 264 B. C. to 404 A. D., gladiatorial combats prevailed. Titus once staged games which included mortal struggles among three thousand gladiators, while Trajan put on a spectacle that lasted a hundred and twenty-three days and consumed the blood of ten thousand victims. Novelty after novelty was demanded. Men were compelled to fight wild beasts, dwarfs were introduced for the amusement of spectators, women fought each other to death. The extreme callousness of the age is indicated by the perpetuation of these games century after century without any effective protest.

The stage of that era was often highly indecent. "The exhibition of licentious shows and immoral plays," says C. L. Brace, "had a profound influence. The extremes to which they were carried cannot ever be explained in modern writings. In fact, few classical scholars who have not waded

⁴See a chapter by Samuel Dickey, "Some Economic and Social Conditions of Asia Minor Affecting the Expansion of Christianity," in *Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by S. J. Case.

through the disgusting mire of a large part of Roman literature can have even an idea of the depth of obscenity and immorality which it reached."⁵ Races between nude women were common. The license of the festivals was notorious. Shocking sexual irregularity was widely prevalent. For centuries prostitution had been accepted as normal and necessary. Courtesans abounded and frequently were accorded high honours. Pericles had openly consorted with the infamous Aspasia, Socrates had publicly visited Theodota in company with his pupils, while Demosthenes had acclaimed the hetairai above wives. Unnatural vices were widely practised, even by such notables as Julius Cæsar, Antoninus, Hadrian, and Trajan.

In addition to the terrible ravages of slavery, poverty, cruelty, and immorality, all classes in that period were victimized by fear of unseen powers. The air was supposed to be densely populated with spirits, good and evil. The reality of the existence of demons was rarely questioned either by pagans or the early Christians. A classic description of the activities of evil spirits is given by Tertullian:

"The ruin of man was their sole aim. From the outset man's overthrow was essayed by these spirits in their wickedness. Accordingly they proceed to inflict diseases and evil accidents of all kinds on our bodies, while by means of violent assaults they procure sudden and extraordinary excesses of the soul. Both to soul and to body they have access by their subtle and extremely fine substance. Invisible and

⁵*Gesta Christi*, p. 64.

intangible, those spirits are not visible in the act; it is in their effects that they are frequently observed, as when, for example, some mysterious poison in the breeze blights the blossom of fruit trees and the grain, or nips them in the bud, or destroys the ripened fruit, the poisonous atmosphere exhaling, as it were, some noxious breath, with like obscurity, the breath of demons and of angels stirs up many a corporation in the soul by serious passions, vile excesses or cruel lusts accompanied by various errors. Every spirit is winged, angel and demon alike. Hence in an instant they are everywhere. The whole world is just one place to them.”⁶

Various forms of insanity and epilepsy were regarded as demon possession. Multitudes lived daily in mortal fear of evil spirits.

Apathy and satiety characterized the more prosperous, while misery and despair were the lot of the dispossessed. It is said that among the upper classes suicide was so frequent as to constitute the normal form of death. One thrill after another had lost its attractiveness and many were overcome with an unbearable weariness. The joy and zest of life had gone. Annihilation seemed preferable to nausea and disgust. While the depressed classes were so racked with pain and distraught with fear that many sought escape by the gateway of death.

This was the soil into which the message of the early Christians fell. Salvation full and free was offered to all who would accept Christ and confess his name; while those who rejected him were warned that

⁶See Harnack, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 125-146; and T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religion in the Early Roman Empire*, pp. 96-102, 150.

not only would they suffer in this lifetime, they would be lost in the world to come. Throughout the first three centuries Christians almost uniformly regarded the present world as evil and condemned unsparingly pagan practices and institutions. In order to be saved a man must repent and be baptized into the new religion. Salvation was the exclusive gift of Christ. "There is no salvation through anyone else," cried Peter, "for there is no one else in the world who has been named to men as their only means of being saved."⁷ The reward of those who accept Christ's free gift of eternal life is described in glowing terms in the Book of Revelation:

"They will never be hungry or thirsty again, and never again will the sun or any burning heat distress them, for the Lamb who is in the centre of the throne will be their shepherd, and will guide them to the springs of living water, and God will wipe every tear from their eyes . . . There will be no more death, nor any grief or crying or pain . . . The principal street of the city was pure gold, as transparent as glass. I saw no temple in it, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are its temple. The city does not need the sun nor the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God lighted it, and the Lamb is its lamp . . . Nothing unclean will ever enter it, nor anyone who indulges in abominable practices and falsehoods, but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life."⁸

The early Christians not only offered salvation in the world to come, they preached freedom from the power of demons in the present world. According to

⁷Acts 4:12 (Goodspeed).

⁸Revelation 7:16, 17; 21:4, 21-23, 27 (Goodspeed).

their belief the very purpose of the coming of Jesus into the world was to combat Satan and his hosts. The casting out of demons is referred to frequently in the Gospels. When the Twelve and the Seventy were sent out they were commissioned to cast out evil spirits. "It was as exorcisers," says Harnack, "that Christians went out into the great world, and exorcism formed one very powerful method of their mission and propaganda. It was a question not simply of exorcising and vanquishing the demons that dwelt in individuals, but also of purifying all public life of them. For the age was ruled by the black one and his hordes." Practically every large church had regular exorcists and the practice of exorcism was common among Christian missionaries. Numerous cases are on record where individuals regarded themselves as having been delivered from the power of demons by the gospel of Christ. In an age when superstition reigned supreme, this ability of the primitive Christians to dispel fear of demons was undoubtedly an important factor in the spread of the new religion.

3. THE PRACTICE OF LOVE AND SHARING

It is a gross error, however, to conclude that the emphasis upon future salvation and removal of the fear of demons were wholly or even primarily responsible for the rapid expansion of Christianity. From the very beginning Christians were motivated by the loftiest ethical principles and exhibited the noblest moral conduct. "Behold how these Christians love one another," was the exclamation of many a

pagan. In his memorable chapter on "The Gospel of Love and Charity," Harnack lists ten varieties of benevolence carried on by early followers of Jesus.⁹ They were noted far and wide for their generosity. When it is recalled that most of the early Christians were recruited from the ranks of slaves, serfs, and the poorer classes, the amounts expended upon various charitable enterprises were really amazing. In 250 A. D. the church in Rome supported about one hundred clergy and fifteen hundred poor persons and had an annual relief budget of from \$25,000 to \$50,000. The church was especially solicitous for widows and children. It will be recalled that James had defined true religion as visiting widows and orphans in their distress. Great consideration was shown to the sick, the infirm and disabled, and the poor, including non-Christians. So much attention was paid to prisoners languishing in the mines that Licinius passed a law to the effect that "no one was to show kindness to sufferers in prison by supplying them with food, and that no one was to show mercy to those who were starving in prison." A common fund was provided with which to care for the burial of the poor. "We cannot bear," says Lactantius, "that the image and workmanship of God should be exposed as a prey to wild beasts and birds, but we restore it to the earth from which it was taken." Great heroism and generosity were shown by many Christians in times of plague and famine and calamity.

The record of the early Christians with regard to

⁹*Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 147-198.

slavery was paradoxical; they took the institution for granted and made no serious effort to abolish it, yet they showed great kindness to slaves and sought to ameliorate their lot. Many Christians, even clergymen and bishops, owned slaves. Paul had sent the slave Onesimus back to Philemon and seemed neither to have asked nor expected his release. Nevertheless, converted slaves were regarded as brothers and sisters and accepted as full members of the church. Slaves became clergymen and even bishops. The same scale of values and virtues prevailed among Christian slaves as among their masters. Owners were strictly charged to treat slaves in a humane and kindly manner. To set a slave free was highly praiseworthy. It is obvious, however, that the inherent incompatibility between slavery and the religion of Jesus dawned very slowly on his followers. Brace tells us that it was not until the Ninth Century that the first recorded stand against slavery itself was taken by St. Theodore, who said: "Thou shalt possess no slave, neither for domestic service nor for the labourer of the fields, for man is made in the image of God."¹⁰ Probably the expectation of the speedy ending of the world caused them to minimize the evils of the institution. To their credit, however, it must be said that, in spite of some recorded cases of extreme cruelty, the early Christians treated slaves as brothers and sisters and sought in many ways to improve their conditions.

While it is natural that Christians should have manifested more affection and concern for each

¹⁰ Brace, *Gesta Christi*, p. 42.

other than for pagans, the record is filled with evidence that their benevolences were by no means confined within their own ranks but overflowed to destitute and needy pagans as well. Moreover, to a marked degree they refrained from manifesting hatred toward their persecutors; indeed, it was their custom to follow the admonition of Paul: "Your love must be genuine . . . Bless your persecutors; bless them; do not curse them . . . If your enemy is hungry, feed him. If he is thirsty, give him something to drink. For if you do, you will heap burning coals upon his head. Do not be conquered by evil, but conquer evil with good."¹¹

Not many times in history have groups suffered as much abuse and persecution with so little resentment and with so much genuine good will as was shown by the Christians of the first three centuries. Passages similar to the following one by the unknown writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* abound in the literature of that period: "They love all men, and they are persecuted by all. They are reviled, and they bless; they are insulted, and they respect. Doing good they are punished as evil-doers; being punished they rejoice as if they were thereby quickened by life. In a word, what the soul is in the body, this the Christians are in the world"¹²

4. PERSONAL PURITY AND FAMILY LOYALTY

No contrast between Christian and pagan was greater than that between their respective attitudes

¹¹Romans 12:9, 14, 20, 21 (Goodspeed).

¹²Quoted by Edward Grubb, *Christianity as Life*, p. 206.

and their practice with regard to sex questions and the family. We have already noted some of the evidence of the depravity of morals which prevailed in the Græco-Roman world. But many additional pages would be required to deal at all adequately with the facts.¹³ Sexual irregularity among men was taken as a matter of course throughout that whole region. Here and there a moralist lifted his voice against immorality or a group adopted ascetic practices, but these were utterly unable to hold back the tide of vice and depravity which swept over the entire land. Unnatural practices which are not even mentionable in our day were terribly prevalent. Among the Greeks women were sharply divided into two categories: wives and courtesans. The former lived in close seclusion and had no part in public life. Their activities were confined exclusively to domestic duties. They seldom were seen in public and were not even allowed to appear at their own table when male guests were present. The strictest of fidelity was demanded. A virtuous woman was under perpetual tutelage: to her father, then to her husband, and in widowhood to her sons. Courtesans were the only women who participated fully in all forms of social and intellectual pursuits. The results were that while Greece produced more men of genius than any other land, she was extraordinarily barren of great women.

Among the early Romans absolute power over women resided in the father, husband, or son. Nevertheless, during that period women frequently en-

¹³See a notable chapter on "The Position of Women," in the *History of European Morals*, by W. E. H. Lecky, Vol. 2, pp. 291-394.

joyed an exalted status. Wives went about freely with husbands and entertained on a sumptuous scale. Numerous cases of absolute fidelity and deep affection between husbands and wives are on record. By a strange paradox, however, during the period under review Roman women gained a higher legal position but lost ground morally. Divorce was granted upon request of either party and became notoriously frequent. Seneca tells of women who reckoned their age by the number of their husbands rather than by the consuls; Juvenal speaks of a woman who had eight husbands within five years; while St. Jerome refers to a wife who was married to her twenty-third husband, she herself being his twenty-first wife. Alarming was the tendency to refrain altogether from marriage. Tiberius found it necessary to make a special law prohibiting women of noble birth from enrolling themselves as prostitutes. Lecky remarked that "there have certainly been many periods in history when virtue was more rare than under the Cæsars; but there has probably never been a period when vice was more extravagant or uncontrolled." The vast number of female slaves, the voluptuous games of Flora, the audacious indecencies of the stage, the flagrant exposure of both sexes at the public baths, the licentious paintings everywhere exhibited, the obscenity of the literature, the general coarseness and callousness produced by continuous warfare, the low value placed upon human life as manifested by the ferocity of their sports and the prevalence of suicide, the impotence of the prevailing religions—all combined to produce

a depth of depravity rarely equalled in human history and never surpassed.

In the midst of vileness and filth the early Christians lived on the high level of chastity and fidelity. While there were undoubtedly lapses, some of them notorious, the gulf between the moral code and practices of Christians and those of their contemporaries was wide and deep. The followers of Jesus were adamant in their stand against irregular sexual relations. Early Christian literature abounds with denunciation and warnings against lust and all forms of sexual depravity. The single standard prevailed rigidly. Indeed, absolute continence for unmarried persons and even for married couples except for procreation was held up as the Christian ideal. Monogamy was regarded as divinely ordained. Divorce was granted only for adultery, and second marriages were generally regarded as equivalent to adultery, and usually were forbidden altogether.

Women enjoyed an exalted status, although not absolute equality with men. They were accepted as full members of the church and frequently were noted for zeal. They were admonished to keep silent in the church and to be subordinate to the husband in the home. Christian apologists were fond of drawing contrasts between the position and character of Christian women and those of pagans. Childhood also was raised to a higher level. Abortion and infanticide were regarded with horror. The former had been recommended by Aristotle and the latter countenanced by Plato. Infanticide was provided for in the legislation of Plato and Aristotle and in the actual

laws of Lycurgus and Solon. Destruction of unborn children and the exposure of infants were practised almost universally among pagans. A regular business developed of rescuing exposed girls and training them for prostitution. The record of Christians, however, was absolutely consistent in denouncing both abortion and infanticide as murder. Parents were urged to train their children in the Christian virtues and to bring them into church membership.

There is much evidence to show that family life among Christians was, as a rule, on a much nobler basis than among their contemporaries. Indeed, the revulsion of Christians against the licentiousness of the age was so extreme that they adopted attitudes and practices which led to a long series of terrible consequences. By the Third Century celibacy had become glorified and asceticism far advanced. Nevertheless, the record is very clear that the superior morality and more loyal family attachments were major factors in the expansion of early Christianity. "There can indeed be little doubt," says Lecky, who will scarcely be accused of bias in favour of Christians, "that for nearly two hundred years after its establishment in Europe, the Christian community exhibited a moral purity which, if it has been equalled, has never for any long period been surpassed."¹⁴

5. REJECTION OF VIOLENCE AND WAR

Attention has already been called to the fact that the corner stones of the ancient world rested on

¹⁴*Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 12.

violence. Christians of that day, on the other hand, to a very marked degree repudiated the use of force and the practice of war. Fortunately, the evidence on this question has been presented in an exhaustive manner by Harnack and Cadoux.¹⁵ The latter tells us that "no Christian ever thought of enlisting in the army after his conversion until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A. D.) at earliest," and that "with one or two possible exceptions no soldier joined the church and remained a soldier" until that time.¹⁶

Christian literature during the first two centuries is filled with condemnation of strife and dissension, war and slaughter. Taking life in war was frequently called murder, and murder was uniformly and unanimously condemned by Christian apologists. The New Testament and subsequent Christian documents contain innumerable passages in praise of peace and in denunciation of war. Harnack enumerates the following ethical barriers in the way of Christians who contemplated service in the army: "the shedding of blood on the battlefield, the use of torture in the law-courts, the passing of death-sentence by officers and the execution of them by common soldiers, the unconditional military oath, the all-pervading worship of the Emperor, the sacrifices in which all were expected in some way to participate, the average

¹⁵ C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude Toward War*; Harnack's *Militia Christi* appears only in German, although many English writers make reference to it.

¹⁶ Cadoux, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 245.

behaviour of soldiers in peacetime, and other idolatrous and offensive customs."¹⁷

A characteristic comment is that of Justin Martyr, in a letter to Emperor Antoninus Pius about 150 A.D.: "Twelve men went out from Jerusalem into the world, and they were ignorant men, unable to speak; but by the power of God they told every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach all men the word of God. And we who formerly slew one another not only do not make war against our enemies, but, for the sake of not telling lies or deceiving those who examine us, gladly die confessing Christ."¹⁸

In spite of all this evidence, however, we cannot be certain that the early Christians were irrevocably opposed to all war. We are confronted with the extraordinary double fact that in all the literature of that period there is no explicit statement that the profession of a soldier is wrong for a Christian, while "no Church writer before Athanasios (Fourth Century) ventured to say that it was not only permissible, but praiseworthy, to kill enemies in war, without the qualification—expressed or implied—that he was speaking of pagans only."¹⁹

In attempting to account for this anomalous situation, the following facts should be kept in mind: Not many Christians actually had to form a definite decision concerning their own personal attitude toward war because Jews and slaves were not enrolled

¹⁷Quoted by Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 105. See also "The Basis of Early Christian Antimilitarism," by Henry J. Cadbury, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XXXVII (1918).

¹⁸Apology XXXIX. Quoted by Grubb, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

¹⁹Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

in the Roman army and because voluntary enlistment usually provided all the soldiers needed. 2. The expectation of the speedy ending of the world was so vivid that many practical social questions were ignored. 3. The problem was complicated because there was no sharp differentiation between soldiers and police, the former doing service as the latter, which made it difficult to condemn the profession of soldiers without appearing to advocate anarchy. 4. The almost universal acceptance of the Old Testament as the inspired Word of God and the absence of the idea of progressive revelation made it improbable that they would condemn outright the ancient wars of the Israelites. 5. The frequent use of military similes and metaphors must have had a subtle effect upon their attitude toward war itself. 6. There was an almost universal opinion among Christians that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans was a direct act of God as punishment for the rejection of Christ by the Jews. 7. The old Jewish concept of a military Messiah had been appropriated, and the conviction was general that when Jesus returned to set up his Kingdom the enemies of God would be destroyed. 8. By the end of the Second Century a certain moral laxity had begun and there was a general tendency toward compromise with prevailing beliefs and practices. 9. There is a possibility that the general acceptance of war by the church after the conversion of Constantine made it less likely that the records of early opposition to war would be preserved.

The uncertainty with regard to the exact position of early Christians regarding war, however, should

not cause us to be confused concerning their attitude toward personal and group enemies. The record here is unequivocal. Hatred and revenge were uniformly condemned. The admonition to overcome evil with good was followed to an unparalleled extent.

6. COURAGE AND SACRIFICIAL DEVOTION

The beliefs and practices of the early Christians made opposition and persecution almost inevitable. To be known as a member of this despised group required great courage. The reason for the hostility of their contemporaries is not difficult to discover. The Romans regarded the Christian church as an illegal society, since the members refused to recognize the religion of the empire by worshipping Cæsar. The attitude of the present-day patriots toward those citizens who will not salute the flag is only a mild parallel to the indignation of the Romans against those persons who refused to take the oaths and burn incense to the emperor. In a community where loyalty to the state took precedence over all other virtues it was natural that the attitude of Christians toward patriotism should bring down upon their heads the contempt and hatred of one hundred per cent. Romans. Christians were called atheists because they offered no sacrifices and as such were blamed for many of the misfortunes and catastrophes which befell Rome. The fact that the Christians frequently met in secret, often at night, gave rise to all manner of rumours. It was widely reported that they were guilty of violent practices and that their im-

morality constituted a public menace. As the church gained in members and influence the Roman authorities became increasingly apprehensive. Distrust of secret societies was a characteristic of governments in that age.

The intolerance and missionary fervour of Christians increased the hatred and opposition with which they were met. They preached a doctrine of exclusive salvation through the church, saying that all those on the outside were doomed to eternal punishment. They were unsparing in their condemnation of pagan beliefs and customs. Looking with horror upon the cruelty of the amphitheatre and the obscenity of the stage, they refrained from participation in the social life of the day. Homes were frequently disrupted when husband or wife became a Christian. Men were especially outraged at the discovery that their wives and daughters were secretly attending gatherings of Christians. The zeal with which the Christian church sought to proselytize was a cause of offense to the devotees of prevailing cults.

The inherent irreconcilability of the new religion and the old customs made inevitable a condition of hostility between Christians and pagans. And so for three hundred years the followers of Christ were steadily abused and intermittently persecuted, after which time they became persecutors themselves. The total number of Christians that perished in the various persecutions is unknown.²⁰ Most scholars are now agreed that the estimates which were long current

²⁰See *The Early Persecutions of the Christians*, by Leon Hardy Canfield. and *Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs*, by E. C. E. Owen.

in Christian circles were grossly exaggerated. The best available evidence seems to indicate that the number of Christian martyrs during the First Century was comparatively small. The earliest persecution under Nero in 64 A. D. was severe but not prolonged and was confined chiefly to the Imperial City. Not until 250 A. D. did a Roman emperor make a determined and systematic effort completely to stamp out Christianity. Local and intermittent persecutions were frequent. The higher magistrates exercised a wide range of police powers, under which many Christians were executed. After the rescript of Trajan to Pliny the Younger in 112 A. D. the admission that one was a Christian was punishable with death, although the authorities were not supposed to search for Christians, and pardon was freely granted upon sacrificing to the emperor.

By a strange irony a severe persecution occurred under Marcus Aurelius, probably one of the wisest and most benevolent ruler of all time. Lightfoot tells us: "The persecutions under Marcus Aurelius extend throughout his reign. They were fierce and deliberate. They were aggravated, at least in some cases, by cruel torture. They had the emperor's direct personal sanction. They broke out in all parts of the empire, in Rome, in Asia Minor, in Gaul, in Africa, possibly also in Byzantium." Beginning with the reign of Septimius Severus (193-211) the state began to seek out and punish Christians. Three of the worst periods were under Decius (249-251), Valerian (253-260), and Diocletian (292-304). Concerning the persecution under Decius, Lecky says: "It would be difficult

to find language too strong to paint its horror. The ferocious instincts of the populace, that were long repressed, burst out anew, and they were not only permitted, but encouraged by the rulers. Far worse than the deaths which menaced those who shrank from the idolatrous sacrifices were the hideous and prolonged tortures by which the magistrates often sought to subdue the constancy of the martyr, the nameless outrages that were sometimes inflicted on the Christian virgin."²¹ Great numbers of Christians were executed during the reign of Valerian. Eusebius estimated that in Egypt alone ten thousand men, not counting women and children, perished. He tells us that he himself saw "a great number perish on one day, some by sword, others by fire. The swords were blunted or broken, the executioners worn out, so that frequent relays were necessary." Practically the entire population of a certain town in Phrygia were burned alive.²²

To be a Christian during the centuries prior to Constantine was a perilous adventure. Old ties had to be severed, insults had to be endured, vile accusations had to be met, intense suffering had to be borne. Thousands perished at the hands of the executioners. Although actual persecution was not continuous, its possibility was never absent. Throughout the period, as Harnack says, "over the head of every Christian hung the sword of Damocles," and any moment it might fall. Only the courageous and devoted were willing to run the risks.

²¹Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 478.

²²See Owen, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

These early centuries produced a long line of martyrs, most of whose names have not been preserved and whose heroic deeds remain unsung. The fragmentary evidence available reveals some of the noblest characters of history. One of the most illustrious was Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who was burned alive in 155 or 156 A. D. Last of the Fathers who had talked personally with disciples of Jesus and himself a disciple of St. John, he was everywhere revered by Christians. The Roman authorities made repeated efforts to persuade him to worship the emperor. "What is the harm of saying 'Cæsar is Lord' and offering incense, and saving your life?" To this inquiry of the High Sheriff he replied: "I do not intend to do as you advise me." When pressed further by the proconsul, Polycarp answered: "Eighty and six years have I served Him and He did me no wrong. How can I blaspheme my King, that saved me." As the flames consumed him, he prayed: "I bless thee that Thou didst deem me worthy of this day and hour."

About a decade later Carpus was martyred in Pergamus. Eusebius tells us: "And he also was hung up and three times scraped with two instruments of torture at once, yet uttered no sound, but as a noble athlete withstood the wrath of the enemy. The proconsul seeing their exceeding patience ordered them to be burnt alive. . . . And Carpus being nailed after Papyrus smiled on them." Near the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius a number of men and women were martyred in the cities of Vienne and Lyons. "They bore the usual running the gauntlet of whips, and

the mauling by the beasts, and everything else that the maddened people on this side or that clamoured for and demanded, and on the top of all the iron chair, whereon their bodies were roasted and filled with the savour the nostrils of the people. . . . After the whips, after the beasts, after the frying-pan, Blandina (a woman) was thrown at last into a net, and cast before a bull. . . . So the bodies of the martyrs, after being subjected to all kinds of contumely and exposed for six days, were then burnt and reduced to ashes by the impious."

The courage and sacrificial devotion manifested by multitudes of Christians was a primary cause of its rapid expansion. The blood of the martyrs was indeed the seed of the church. Men and women who regarded themselves, in the words of Ignatius, as "the wheat of God" and who longed for the day when they should be "ground by the teeth of wild beasts into the pure bread of Christ," became invincible. As Lecky well says: "Noble lives, crowned by heroic deaths, were the best arguments of the infant church. Their enemies themselves not infrequently acknowledged it."

7. THE SOLIDARITY OF THE CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

It was inevitable that the early Christians should be bound together in a most intimate fellowship. Menaced by a hostile environment, recoiling from the pagan practices of the day, holding the same faith in the saving power of their Lord, motivated by love of their kind, craving consolation and security and fellowship, it was natural that they should lean

heavily upon each other. I have already enumerated some of the ways in which they practised mutual aid. Charity was deeply rooted. The infant church not only gave alms to the destitute, it felt a sense of responsibility for securing or furnishing employment to its members. Mendicancy received no encouragement in those early days. Labour was upheld as a duty. "If any will not work, neither let him eat," was accepted as axiomatic. The right of a Christian to employment was likewise recognized. "It was beyond question," says Harnack, "that a Christian brother could demand work from the church, and that the church had to furnish him with work. What bound the members together, then, was not merely the duty of supporting one another—that was simply the *ultima ratio*; it was the fact that they formed a guild of workers in the sense that the churches had to provide work for a brother whenever he required it. This fact seems to me of great importance from the social standpoint. The churches were also labour unions."²³ As is well known, the primitive Christians of Jerusalem practised a form of communal living for a brief period.²⁴ The duty of one church to relieve the distress of another was fully recognized. Generous contributions were frequently sent to less fortunate groups of Christians.

These primitive societies were democratic and cosmopolitan in the highest degree. Men and women, masters and slaves, Jews and Syrians, Greeks and Romans, rich and poor, the educated and the illiter-

²³ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 176.

²⁴ See Acts 4:32-5: 11.

ate, the cultured and the uncouth, all met together on the common basis of brotherhood. The doors were open to all who would enter. No drastic tests were submitted, no preliminary preparations were required. Confession of faith in the Lord Jesus and dedication to his cause were sufficient to earn a warm welcome.

The regular gatherings of the groups were extraordinarily important. It was their custom to assemble for the purpose of breaking bread, prayer, teaching, and fellowship. The Holy Communion was a source of spiritual power and exhilaration. Corporate worship led to an extraordinarily vivid sense of the presence of God. Teaching and preaching were means of fortifying members against assaults from their enemies. Comradeship was necessary if exalted standards were to be maintained. In times of grief and persecution, Christians were saved from despair and apostasy by the loving interest and sacrificial coöperation of the brotherhood. "There has probably never existed upon earth," says Lecky, "a community whose members were bound to one another by a deeper or a purer affection than the Christians, in the days of the persecution."²⁵

At the outset Christian communities were loosely organized. But as their numbers grew and life became increasingly complex they resorted to more formal organizations. The supervision of the funds of the church and the safeguarding of the purity of the faith became too important to be left to chance. So deacons and elders, presbyters and bishops, were elected.

²⁵*Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 450.

Decade after decade the influence and power of these officials increased, until by the middle of the Second Century church government had everywhere become monarchical, with the bishops in full control. Whatever may have been the disastrous spiritual results of this tendency, there is no doubt that the consolidation of ecclesiastical power was a primary factor in the rapid expansion of the Christian church.

8. ULTIMATE COMPROMISE WITH PREVAILING BELIEFS²⁶

In every age and in all lands Christianity has exhibited marvellous powers of adaptation. While this ability on numerous occasions has proved to be a source of great strength, it has many times led to disastrous consequences. Numerical gains often have been acquired at the cost of spiritual vitality; pomp and power frequently have been paid for by sacrificing ethical standards. The more popular a religion becomes, the less likely its adherents are to practise its highest precepts. A comparison of the life of the church in the Third and Fourth centuries with the religion of Jesus reveals a great gulf. In numerous ways Christians of this period made serious compromises with pagan beliefs and customs.²⁷ Theatre going and dice throwing began to be tolerated. Sexual looseness became so common that the literature of the time is filled with denunciations and warnings and imposition of penances. More and more Christians

²⁶ See Arthur Weigall, *The Paganism in Our Christianity*.

²⁷ See T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*.

owned slaves. Some apostate masters sent slaves to sacrifice for them during periods of persecution. By 251 A. D. bishops were devoting so much time to cultivating the favour of Roman officials that Cupria complained bitterly because they were neglecting their spiritual duties. A few years later emperors intrusted Christians with governorships of provinces. In the time of Valerian there were Christian senators. The number of Christians in the armies increased steadily.

The great church historian Eusebius, at the end of the Third Century, draws a distinction between two standards of Christianity, one for the clergy and another for laymen. The latter are permitted to engage in political and military service and secular pursuits generally, while the former are enjoined to celibacy and aloofness from the world. This dual standard opened the way for license on the one hand and asceticism on the other. Tragic disparagement of normal home ties and morbid idealization of celibacy became increasingly prevalent.

Intellectually, the early Christians borrowed heavily from three sources: Judaism, the mystery religions, and Greek philosophy.²⁸ In this connection it should be recalled that Paul had a triple qualification for leadership: he was a Jew of the Jews; he was educated in a Greek city and absorbed its culture; he was a Roman citizen and travelled widely over its domain. Since Jesus was a Jew and most of the primitive Christians were of the same race it was natural and inevitable that the early church should draw

²⁸ See F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Rise of Gentile Christianity*.

freely from the Hebrew Scripture. The Old Testament proved to be an inexhaustible storehouse of spiritual wisdom and inspiration. From its pages Christian apologists proved, at least to their own satisfaction, that the coming of Jesus had been foretold many centuries before and validated their belief in his divine nature. For a considerable period the Old Testament was given a more exalted place than was accorded to the epistles now incorporated in the New Testament. Unfortunately, the early Christians not only appropriated the nobler religious ideals of the Old Testament, they also took over its concept of a God of vengeance. Few ideas have had a bloodier history than that one which attributes to God a willingness to torture those who depart from correct belief and established ritual. Acceptance of the Old Testament idea of Jehovah as a God of war and vengeance was a primary reason why Christians eventually justified war and engaged in its horror. This same concept strengthened their belief in the righteousness of casting unrepentant sinners into an eternal lake of fire. There can be no doubt that many converts came into the church because of fear of eternal damnation if they died outside the faith.

The primitive Christian church also absorbed many ideas and practices from the mystery religions of the Græco-Roman world. Polytheism was everywhere prevalent. That gods rose from the grave was a widely accepted belief. Many of these religions offered salvation to their devoted. Cæsar-worship appeared reasonable to people who never made a clear distinction between gods and supermen. "It seems very

probable, if not quite certain," says Guignebert, "that Paul's childhood was spent in a milieu thoroughly impregnated with the idea of a salvation obtained by the intercession or mediatorship of a god who died and rose again, whose followers share his destiny by means of a mystic union of themselves with him, shown only by a steadfast faith and confidence in him, but also, and one might almost say, *above all*, by symbolic and potent rites and ceremonies."²⁹

By the Fourth Century many forms of magic had crept into the Christian church. Mariolatry and the worship of saints was widespread. Exorcism of evil spirits had been long practised, frequently in ways very similar to pagan rites. By the ignorant and uncultured, baptism was often thought to possess magical efficacy. In the Holy Communion the miracle of transubstantiation was thought to occur. "We are now beginning to see," says Professor Scott, "that the prevalence of those mystery religions was a factor of prime importance in the spread of Christianity. Their teachings were at some points strikingly similar to those of the Gospel, and for this reason had an important influence on Christian thought. Mystical and sacramental elements which had no place in the original message of Jesus gradually found entrance by way of the Eastern cults."³⁰ Dean Inge says: "It was as a mystery religion that Europe accepted Christianity."

Greek philosophy also contributed many ideas to

²⁹ Charles Guignebert, *Christianity, Past and Present*, p. 76.

³⁰ E. F. Scott, *The First Age of Christianity*, pp. 41, 42.

early Christianity.³¹ The Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Hebrews especially reveal the infiltration of Greek thought.³² Many of the Christian writers grew up in communities where the teaching of the Stoics was all-pervasive in cultured circles. Through this philosophy they became familiar with the concept that "reason pervades all things like a fiery essence, and that the soul of man is a spark from this universal reason." Philo, chief exponent of the Alexandrian school of Judaism, who lived during the period 30 B. C.—50 A. D., was another channel through which Greek ideas flowed into the early church. Philo attempted to combine Hebrew religion and Greek philosophy. He gave great impetus to the tendency to allegorize the Old Testament and to derive from it highly speculative ideas which became universal among Christian theologians.³³ Philo's interpretation of the Greek term "Logos" profoundly affected Christian thought. The greatest of the Church Fathers, St. Augustine, was tremendously influenced by Neo-Platonism, which regarded the world of sense as irrational and evil. The tendency toward asceticism within Christian circles was greatly accentuated by the example and teaching of Plotinus, the founder of Neo-Platonism who lived from 204 to 269 A. D.

From the very beginning the Christian church was torn with schisms and heresies. The New Testament writers themselves gave frequent warnings against

³¹ See a notable chapter in Henry Osborn Taylor, *The Mediæval Mind*, Vol. 1, pp. 33-60.

³² See Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-228.

³³ See Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 67-85.

false teachers. The most important of these heresies came to be known as Gnosticism,³⁴ whose chief characteristics were rejection of the Old Testament, repudiation of the God of the Jews as the carnal creator of the world and the enemy of the supreme God, the enthronement of Christ as the incarnation of the light and wisdom of the supreme God and the deliverer of mankind from the captivity of the material elements.

The long struggle with heresy proved in the end to be a source of great strength to the church. It gave impetus to the formation of definite Christian beliefs and practices, and this made for unity. There was a period when it appeared that the new religion might degenerate into a hundred speculative and warring sects. The combat against Gnosticism also hastened the creation of an official ministry and increased their influence and power. Another result was the formation of the canon of the New Testament. Numerous forgeries were in circulation, and the necessity of distinguishing between true and false documents was highly imperative. The tendency toward uniformity was greatly accelerated during the periods of severe persecution at the end of the Third Century. In the end orthodoxy won the victory; but survival and consolidation cost a ghastly price. From the Fourth Century onward Christianity became a vastly different religion from the original religion of Jesus. Many elements of Jesus' faith were retained but they were covered up with numerous accretions from the Græco-Roman world.

³⁴ See Robert Rainy, *The Ancient Catholic Church*, pp. 94-127.

These, then, seem to have been the primary reasons for the rapid expansion of early Christianity: confidence in the resurrection of Jesus and the expectation of his bodily return; the offer of salvation in a decaying civilization; the practice of love and forgiveness and sharing; personal purity and family loyalty; the rejection of violence and war; the exhibition of dauntless courage and sacrificial devotion; the unity and discipline of the Christian fellowship; and, in the end, compromise with prevailing beliefs and institutions.

CHAPTER III

CONTRASTS BETWEEN HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS

I. CHRISTIANITY AND WAR

THE history of organized Christianity's relation to war constitutes a shameful record.¹ Throughout the last sixteen centuries the Christian church has been terribly entangled in the war system. In these latter days there are many signs that point to the complete repudiation of war by the churches, but this desirable end has not yet been attained. It is highly important, therefore, that Christians understand the extent to which the churches have been and still are involved in the war system. Let us begin with a brief examination of the period when Christianity first became politically powerful.

(1) *Constantine, the Christian Warrior*

The closing years of the Third Century witnessed one of the bloodiest periods of persecution of Christians by the Romans in the entire history of the church. The opening decades of the Fourth Century saw Christianity enthroned as the official religion of the Roman Empire, while at the end of this century

¹This is true in spite of the fact that Christianity has done much to mitigate the horrors of war and in some periods has reduced its frequency.

pagan worship was made a crime. Within a single generation this new religion was transformed from a despised and illegal status into an exalted and established position. Such an absolute reversal has few parallels in history.

The story of Constantine's conversion is well known.² He grew up in a religious home where monotheism was accepted and was therefore favourably disposed toward the new religion. In the campaign of 312 against his colleague Maxentius he was directed in a dream to place the monogram and Cross of Christ on the shields of his soldiers. When he obeyed these instructions and won a great victory at Milvian Bridge he attributed his success to the power of Christ and began to extend favours to the church and soon put Christianity on a basis of equality with official paganism. After he became sole emperor in 323 he used all his influence on behalf of the new religion and in opposition to the old cults. Throughout the remainder of his career he was devoted to the church and was baptized just before his death in 337.

It has been said that the four stages of Constantine's attitude toward the church were sympathy, justice, patronage, and control. He certainly became the patron and ruler of the church, but the evidence is clear that he neither understood nor practised the religion of Jesus. The Cross of Christ, instead of being a way of life to be followed, became a magical charm, a fetish, a luck token. By this time the cross had

²See C. B. Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity*; Maude Aline Huttman, *The Establishment of Christianity and the Proscription of Paganism*; John B. Firth, *Constantine the Great*; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, chap. 6.

come to be widely used by Christians as a magical sign before which demons fled. To the very end Constantine's chief conception of Christianity was that of a cult whose prayers and emblems enabled him to triumph in military conflicts and political crises, and whose rites insured eternal salvation. He retained the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, or high priest of the pagan hierarchy, to the very close of his life, as did his successors until 375. After his death the Roman Senate enrolled him among the gods of the heathen Olympus.

During Constantine's reign Christianity became a religion of war, from which it has never been divorced to the present hour. Henceforth the Roman legions fought under the banner of the Cross and carried the monogram of Christ on their shields, in place of the imperial eagle. When his mother Helena brought from Jerusalem two nails which were supposed to have been taken from Jesus' Cross, Constantine used one on his helmet and the other on the bridle of his war horse. By 416 only Christians were allowed to serve in the army!³ Pagan warriors need not apply!

The moral character of Constantine bore little resemblance to that of the founder of the religion which he professed. After he has been given due credit for many noble qualities, it must be admitted that very often his conduct was quite repulsive. His oldest son Crispus was the son of a concubine, Minervina; and either Constantius or Constantine II, born within a few months of each other, was also

³C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, p. 589.

illegitimate.⁴ It was after his conversion that he murdered his conquered colleague and brother-in-law, Licinius; sentenced to death his eleven-year-old nephew; killed his oldest son, Crispus; and brought about the death of his second wife, Fausta, perhaps by suffocation with steam. Yet this semi-pagan and cruel emperor has been canonized as a saint by the Greek Church, and to this day that ancient communion celebrates his memory as "Equal to the Apostles." And concerning his conversion a leading church historian says: "Galilean, thou hast conquered! The ruler of the civilized world lays his crown at the feet of the crucified of Nazareth." What really happened was the capture of the Christian church by a pagan warrior.

(2) *The Crusades*

In no other respect has there been a more striking contrast between organized Christianity and the religion of Jesus than in the conduct of the Crusaders during the two hundred years of their history. Throughout this long period the church instigated, blessed, and often, in the person of some high prelate, led the Crusades. These followers of the Cross were guilty of massacre, treachery, robbery, sexual excesses, and almost every other sin and crime imaginable. The stench they created pollutes the nostrils of Moslems to this day.⁵

From 1095 to 1291 the Christian church never abandoned the struggle to redeem the Holy Sepulchre

⁴Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

⁵In spite of these excesses, the Crusades produced many highly beneficial results, especially in the realms of commerce and culture.

from blasphemous hands. Crusade after Crusade was waged. In order to recover the grave of our Lord hundreds of thousands of his followers lost their lives and an unnumbered multitude of "infidels" were slain. One authority gives four other reasons for the Crusades: the decay of the Eastern Empire; the consequent danger of encroachment by the Arabs and Turks; the relative unity of Europe and the growth of the commercial spirit; and the system of penance.

It is almost impossible for modern Christians to appreciate the depth of emotion which swept over mediæval Christendom at the thought of the tomb of Christ being in the hands of Mohammedans. The vilest of calumnies against the Moslems were blindly received by credulous members of the church. No tale of inhumanity was too horrible to be accepted. In an age when relics and images received reverent adoration from the faithful, it was simply unbearable that the most holy relic of all should be defiled by infidels. The Holy Land was the motherland and the fatherland. No one hundred per cent. patriot can possibly be as deeply outraged by the desecration of his nation's flag as pious churchmen were scandalized by pagan pollution of holy places. Long before the Crusades began large numbers of pilgrims endured incredible hardships and perils in order to set foot upon the sacred soil, especially at those periodic intervals when the end of the world was prophesied. The devout mind could conceive of no greater glory than to be in Jerusalem at the hour of the triumphant return of Christ.

Vast enthusiasm for the Crusades was created by the offer of a plenary indulgence, that is, full remission of all works required by the sacrament of penance, to those who would "take the cross," as enlistment was called. Priests and bishops and popes agreed that all those who fell in the holy war were assured of eternal salvation; while excommunication was threatened against those who broke their vow. They were also freed from arrest for debt and from usury. Moreover, the church assumed the guardianship of their families. The spirit of adventure moved many in that age, as in every other. Escape from monotony and hard labour has ever been sought by masses of people. The desire for gain was also operative. Alluring pictures of plunder of the fabulous wealth of the East were drawn. The story of Tancred's six camel-loads of spoils, for example, swept over Europe and aroused the utmost enthusiasm. All these factors combined to produce a motley company, "with debtors and criminals abounding."

The officials of the church went to the wildest extremes in seeking to arouse Christendom. Before a vast assembly in 1097 Pope Urban II said: "If you must have blood, bathe your hands in the blood of infidels. I speak to you harshly, because my ministry obliges me to do so: soldiers of hell become soldiers of the living God." Whereupon the multitude shouted: "It is the will of God."⁶ Bernard, the holiest man of his century, cried out: "The din of arms, the dangers, the labours, the fatigues of war, are the penances that God now imposes upon you. Hasten

⁶J. F. Michaud, *The History of the Crusades*, Vol. I, p. 51.

then to expiate your sins by victories over the infidels. . . . Cursed be he who does not stain his sword with blood.”⁷ In 1188 the Pope ordered prayers against the Saracens to be said daily. All Crusaders wore the cross sewn on their garments. Many were known to have burned the mark of the cross into their flesh. The Gospels were often borne aloft in battle.

The ferocity with which the Christian armies fought and the ruthlessness with which they slaughtered their foes have rarely, if ever, been surpassed in the history of warfare. The capture of Jerusalem at the conclusion of the First Crusade was accompanied by deeds of the wildest savagery on the part of the Christian soldiers. “Neither age nor sex were spared. Children’s brains were dashed out against the stones, or their living bodies were whirled in demoniacal sport from the walls. Women were outraged.” In a letter to the Pope, Godfrey said that in Solomon’s Porch and in the Temple the Crusaders rode in Saracen blood up to the knees of their horses.⁸ It is said that Godfrey himself did not join in the massacre but instead spent the time quietly engaged in prayer in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The pillaging and slaughtering continued for a week. An eyewitness wrote that “not even a sucking child, male or female, escaped from the hands of the slayers.”

At the siege of Nicæa the Crusaders cut off the heads of a thousand prisoners and hurled them from

⁷James Ludlow, *The Age of the Crusades*, p. 167.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 132.

catapults over the walls of the city. In describing the capture of that fortress, Anselme of Ribemont wrote to the Archbishop of Rheims: "Our men, returning in victory and bearing many heads fixed upon pikes, furnished a joyful spectacle for the people of God."⁹ Bohemond commanded that Syrian spies should be spitted and roasted.¹⁰ The Christians once sent four camel-loads of human heads to the Egyptian ambassador.¹¹ The Pope's legate at the siege of Antioch, Bishop Puy, advised the Crusaders to cut off the heads of the Saracens, stick them on lances, and expose them to the enemy on the ramparts.¹² And when the victory was won the warriors of the cross "contemplated with joy fifteen hundred heads separated from their trunks, which were paraded in triumph through the army."¹³ The Crusaders were known to have burned the dead bodies of their foes in order to secure the coins which they believed had been swallowed. Before the walls of Antioch the famished Christians devoured the putrid flesh of the Turks they had slain.¹⁴

Not only did the Crusaders ruthlessly slaughter infidels, they sometimes released their fury against their fellow Christians. In 1204 they captured and looted Constantinople, the capital of Eastern Christendom. The entire city was plundered. One narrator boasted: "Never since the world was created was

⁹James Ludlow, *The Age of the Crusades*, p. 94.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 106.

¹²*Journal of Mental Science*, Vol. 53, p. 337.

¹³Michaud, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 144.

¹⁴Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

there as much booty gained in one city." Tombs were robbed. Women were outraged. Churches were desecrated. Horses were ridden into the sanctuary. Communion cups were used in drunken revels. Prostitutes danced upon the sacred altar. All this was part of the holy war against sacrilegious infidels.

(3) *Wars of Religion*

In a previous chapter we have considered the attitude of the early church toward war. In the next section we shall examine the record of Christianity in relation to modern secular wars. Just here it is our melancholy duty to record a portion of the sordid story of the wars between various factions of organized Christianity.¹⁵ We have already noted the ferocity with which Christians waged war against Mohammedans during the period of the Crusades. That the Catholic church in the early years of the Thirteenth Century also engaged in a mighty crusade against the Albigenses, a heretical sect, is not so widely known. Christian was now pitted against Christian. The Dominicans were intrusted with the responsibility of preaching the Crusade and arousing the enthusiasm of the faithful. The Third Lateran Council proclaimed indulgences for those who enlisted in the holy war. Eternal life was promised to those who perished, and two years' remission of penance to all who survived.

More than twenty thousand knights and two hundred thousand footmen rallied to the standard of the

¹⁵ See *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. 3, entitled "Wars of Religion"; also J. W. Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France*.

Cross. The city of Beziers was taken by storm, the scene that followed being described by the Papal legate in these words: "Our men, sparing neither rank nor sex nor age, slew about twenty thousand souls with the edge of the sword; and, making a huge slaughter, pillaged and burned the whole city, by reason of God's wrath wonderously kindled against it."¹⁶ More than five hundred castles and towns were captured and the whole countryside "reduced to the appearance of a desert." Professor J. B. Mullinger of Cambridge tells us that during a period of two years there occurred "long series of plunderings and massacres, accompanied by almost unprecedented atrocities."¹⁷

During the Albigensian crusade, severe measures were also taken against the Waldenses, another heretical sect. In 1210 the Archbishop of Turin drove the Waldenses out of his diocese. In Mayence and Bingen fifty were burned at the stake. For the next three centuries they were subjected to intermittent persecution, the period of the greatest suffering coming about the middle of the Seventeenth Century, when nine thousand were killed in battle and twelve thousand carried off as prisoners.

At the sack of Munster the army of a Catholic bishop mercilessly slaughtered Anabaptists. Men and women were thrown from windows and caught on spears below. Three of the heretical leaders were exhibited in an iron cage, tortured with hot pinchers,

¹⁶ G. G. Coulton, *The Death Penalty for Heresy from 1184 to 1921 A. D.*, p. 7.

¹⁷ See the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 1, pp. 277-287.

their tongues torn out; and finally they were stabbed to death. The cage containing their dead bodies was then hoisted high on the tower of the Church of St. Lamberti, where the remains "hung undisturbed except by wind and storm, for three centuries and a half." We are solemnly assured, in a volume published by the Harvard University Press in 1925, that they were still hanging there when the World War broke out.¹⁸

In 1524 Thomas Munzer, pastor of the church in Zwickau and leader of an extreme wing of the Protestants, took up arms on behalf of the German peasants. His fiery appeal to his followers to take up arms included these words: "Arise, fight the battle of the Lord! On! on! on! Now is the time! The wicked tremble when they hear of you. Be pitiless! Heed not the groans of the impious! On! on! on! while the fire is burning; on while the hot sword is yet reeking with the blood of the slaughter! Give the fire no time to go out, the sword no time to cool. Kill all the proud ones."¹⁹ Unfortunately for Thomas, the enemy was too strong, with the result that he was beheaded and one hundred thousand peasants were slaughtered before the war was ended.

During the century following the birth of the Reformation in France, nine successive wars, covering a period of sixty years, were waged between the Christians of that country. "Bands of robbers and ravishers," says Dr. Preserved Smith, "under the names of Christian parties but savages at heart, put

¹⁸ See Frederic Palmer, *Heretics, Saints, and Martyrs*, p. 36.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

the whole people to ransom and to sack. Indeed, the Wars of Religion were like hell." On the eve of St. Bartholomew's Day, 1582, Admiral Coligny, leader of the Huguenots, was assassinated by Catholic officials of state and the systematic annihilation of Protestants begun. Before noon of the next day two thousand victims were slaughtered in Paris alone. News of the massacre was celebrated by Catholics in Rome with hymns of praise and rejoicing. The Cardinal of Lorraine congratulated the king on the "very Christian and heroic deliberations and executions made, not only in Paris, but all through the chief towns—better than I could have expected or desired."²⁰ The number of persons slain has been variously estimated from ten thousand to twenty thousand. During the siege of Paris in 1590 by Henry IV the suffering of the inhabitants became so acute that they ate dogs, cats, and rats. The bones of animals and even dead persons were ground up and used as flour. Thirteen thousand people died of starvation and twenty thousand succumbed to fever.²¹

The most sanguinary fighting of all religious wars took place in the Netherlands.²² Philip II of Spain boasted that he would bring the Protestants of the Low Countries back to the fold of Rome or "so to waste their land that neither the natives could live there nor should any thereafter desire the place for habitation." Every fiendish device imaginable was

²⁰R. T. Smith, *The Church in France*, p. 288.

²¹Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation*, p. 226.

²²See J. L. Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*.

resorted to. Because he trampled upon the sacred wafer, Le Blas, a velvet manufacturer of Tournay, was tortured to death by having his right hand and foot twisted off between red-hot irons, his tongue was torn out by the roots, and he was then swung to and fro over a slow fire until he was roasted. The inquisitor Titelmann convicted John de Swarte, his wife and four children of "reading the Bible, and of praying in their own doors, and had them all immediately burned."²³ After the Inquisition had taken its horrible toll of many thousands, one authority placing the figure as high as fifty thousand, the Protestants revolted and were guilty of many excesses. Philip replied by sending an army of Spanish veterans under the leadership of the infamous Duke of Alva, of whom Motley said: "Such an amount of stealth and ferocity, of patient vindictiveness and universal bloodthirstiness, were never found in a savage beast of the forest, and but rarely in a human bosom." Within six years this monster executed from six thousand to eighteen thousand heretics and rebels. "Columns and stakes in every street, the door-posts of private houses, the fences in the fields were laden with human carcasses, strangled, burned, beheaded. The orchards in the country bore on many a tree the hideous fruit of human bodies."

When Zutphen was captured Alva sent orders to his son to kill every man in the city. Some were stabbed, some were hanged, some were drowned, and many stripped of their clothes and driven out to freeze in the snow. Similar punishment was meted out

²³Motley, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 337.

to the inhabitants of many other cities. In Naarden five hundred men and women were assembled in the Gast Huis church and slaughtered like sheep, after which the church was burned, consuming the dead and dying. The entire city was then sacked by Spanish soldiers of the Cross. Women were outraged on the very altars of churches. Burial of the dead was forbidden and for three weeks innumerable corpses polluted the streets. One of the cavaliers who participated in this butchery wrote: "The sack of Naarden was a chastisement which must be believed to have taken place by express permission of a Divine Providence." During the two days following the capture of Antwerp the Catholic soldiers murdered not less than eight thousand victims. "Hell seemed emptied of its fiends," commented Motley.

In the end, however, the Protestant forces under the leadership of William the Silent were victorious and threw off the Spanish yoke. In the course of the long years of fighting they also were guilty of many atrocities. During the siege of Haarlem, for example, they hanged a number of prisoners, including a twelve-year-old boy, and drowned several women. At Gorkum fifteen Franciscans were horribly mutilated and then hanged. Diedrich Sonony, governor of a portion of southern Holland and a supporter of William of Orange, accused Manning Koppezoon of being a Catholic and plotting conflagration and tortured him mercilessly. After the body of the victim had been "singed from head to heel, and his feet almost flayed, he was left for six weeks to crawl about his dungeon on his knees. He was then brought back

to the torture rooms and again stretched upon the rack, while a large earthen vessel, made for the purpose, was placed, inverted, upon his naked body. A number of rats were introduced under this cover, and hot coals were heaped upon the vessel, till the rats, rendered furious by the heat, gnawed into the very bowels of the victim, in their agony to escape. The holes thus torn in his bleeding flesh were filled with red-hot coals. . . . The final sentence ordained that his heart should be torn from his living body, and thrown in his face, after which his head was to be taken off and exposed on the church steeple of his native village. His body was then to be cut in four, and a quarter fastened upon different towers of the city of Alkmaar.”²⁴

(4) *Secular Wars*

For sixteen centuries the Christian church has been terribly entangled in the war system. With extraordinary consistency it has sanctioned and blessed the various wars waged by so-called Christian governments during all these centuries. There have been many individual dissenters and a number of protesting sects. *In numerous ways the churches have helped to mitigate the horrors of war and to restrict its scope.*²⁵ But in practically every instance where a Christian power was involved a large majority of the clergymen and laymen of that country have given their indorsement and support to the war being waged by their government. Moreover, in cases

²⁴ Motley, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, pp. 30, 31.

²⁵ See Brace, *Gesta Christi*, pp. 137-177; and *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 12, pp. 683-685.

where the various belligerents were Christian nations, the church with absolute impartiality has blessed both sides of every war.

From the tragic hour when the Emperor Constantine captured Christianity there has not been a day when the church was free from responsibility for the perpetuation of the war system. Most ecclesiastics since the Fourth Century have approved of war as a method of seeking security and justice. There are, of course, notable historical exceptions, including Wyclif and John Huss and George Fox, but as a general rule the keenest intellects and the noblest spirits of the church have rejected the philosophy and practices of pacifism.²⁶ Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, and Calvin, chief among the formative minds of Christendom, although separated by the centuries and antagonistic in many of their views, are united in their belief that war is legitimate when used in a righteous cause. For centuries the Catholic church has maintained the position that as a last resort a nation is justified in going to war if menaced by foreign aggression, if its rights are violated by an alien power, if future security demands the punishment of the aggressor, or if necessary to stop the oppression of innocent peoples.

This is substantially the attitude of the major Protestant bodies as well. By a strange inconsistency, Luther justified all wars of self-defense except those waged by subjects against tyrannical rulers. He un-

²⁶ See a notable article by A. C. McGiffert, *The American Journal of Theology*, Vol. 19, pp. 323-345; and Edward Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Vol. 1, pp. 345-370.

conditionally condemned rebellion and revolution. In referring to the peasants' revolt, Luther said: "An ass must be beaten and the rabble governed by force. God knew this well, and therefore He gave the rulers not a fox's tail but a sword."²⁷ To the soldiers who took the field against the peasants, he said: "If you die in battle against them, you could never have a more blessed end for you die obedient to God's Word in Romans 13, and in the service of love to free your neighbour from the bands of hell and the devil."²⁸ In later years Luther showed no regret for his attitude toward this rebellion. Indeed, he went so far as to say: "Preachers are the biggest murderers about, for they admonish the authorities to fulfill their duty and punish the wicked. I, Martin Luther, slew all the peasants in the rebellion, for I said they should be slain; all their blood is on my head. But I cast it on our Lord God, who commanded me to speak in this way."²⁹

Article 16 of the Augsburg Confession specifically states that a Christian may lawfully engage in a just war. The Thirty-seventh Article of the Church of England says: "It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the warres." It will be noticed that the participation of Christians is not even restricted to "just" or "righteous" wars. One of the charges against the Anabaptists was that they condemned war as unchristian.

²⁷Quoted by R. H. Murray, *Erasmus and Luther*, p. 245.

²⁸Preserved Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

²⁹Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

Thousands of pages could easily be filled with quotations from eminent Christians of the last four centuries vigorously upholding the legitimacy of war in a righteous cause. Jeremy Taylor said that "war is the rod of God in the hands of princes." Hegel used this analogy: "Just as the movement of the ocean prevents the corruption which would be the result of perpetual calm, so by war people escape the corruption which would be occasioned by a continuous or perpetual peace."³⁰ Ruskin went so far as to say: "War is the foundation of all the arts . . . it is the foundation of all the high virtues and faculties of men. . . . I found, in brief, that all great nations learned their truth of word, and strength of thought, in war; that they were nourished in war, and wasted by peace; taught by war, and deceived by peace; trained by war and betrayed by peace—in a word, that they were born in war and expired in peace."³¹

All the wars waged by the United States have received the sanction and support of the churches. True enough, ecclesiastics were divided in their loyalties during the Revolutionary War, many ministers being sympathetic with the Tories. But practically all were agreed as to the righteousness of war in a just cause. In a sermon before the University of Oxford on December 13, 1776, Myles Cooper, President of King's College, later Columbia University, in New York City, referred to the war in these words: "If it be right in a Sovereign State to attempt the forcible sup-

³⁰Quoted by Westermarck, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 368.

³¹John Ruskin, *Crown of Wild Olives*, pp. 132, 133.

pression of a wicked and unprovoked Rebellion, after all persuasive methods have failed, then the War is just, on the part of the Government Never was there a more worthy Object of Military Exertion; never was the Power of any Nation better employed! . . . Having made the necessary Preparation for the important and unavoidable Contest, we are now to put our trust in Almighty God for Success; and implore his Blessing on our Fleets and Armies."

During the Civil War a parallel situation arose, the churches generally upholding the cause of the governments of the regions in which they were located. With the exception of a few pacifist groups, however, the churches supported one side or the other.³² The slavery controversy split the Methodist Episcopal church and the Baptist church each into two divisions. The Methodists of the North were so vigorous and enthusiastic in their support of the war that Abraham Lincoln was able to write to the General Convention of 1864: "It is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church! bless all the Churches!"³³

In the *Boston Review*, a periodical devoted to theology and literature, for May, 1863, there appeared an unsigned article on "The Sword and Christianity," from which the following words are taken:

³² See H. G. Gilbert, *The Bible and Universal Peace*, pp. 154-194.

³³ Quoted by J. M. Buckley, *A History of the Methodists in the United States*, p. 512.

"War is not the greatest evil in the world. . . . There has been nothing yet found among men like the smell of gunpowder, for making a nation perceive the fragrance of divinity in truth. . . . No people ever did, or ever could, feel the power of Christian principle growing up like an inspiration through the national manhood, until the worth of it had been thundered on the battlefield."

Another unsigned article in an earlier issue said:

"We are prepared to maintain that the war, on the part of the North and West, is, in its proper foundations and objects, a Christian and most religious war. . . . If the entire armed host of the United States, from the commander-in-chief to the lowest subaltern, was made up of sturdy Puritans and Calvinists, with the Bible in one pocket and the Assembly's catechism in the other, all singing . . . 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow,' to the tune of 'Old Hundred,' the spectacle, to our mind, would be perfect in its concinnity, and sublime as when Michael and his angels fought against the dragon and his angels."³⁴

In 1863 the Reverend Henry Whitney Bellows, D.D., said: "To rally round the President—without question or dispute—is the first and most sacred duty of loyal citizens, when he announces, not that the Constitution merely, but that the National life and existence are in peril. He is the official judge of this. . . . Thus brethren, do I commend to you the cause of unconditional loyalty." The Reverend Doctor Pinckney, pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Ascension in Washington and subsequently Bishop of Maryland, was barred from his own church by a

³⁴July, 1861, pp. 403, 404.

guard of bayonets on the ground that he refused to pray for a Northern victory. Horace Bushnell, one of the most eminent ministers of the North, said in a sermon: "Peace will do for angels, but war is God's ordinance for sinners."

The churches of the South were solidly behind the Confederacy. "Had Jefferson Davis been approached on the subject," says Professor C. B. Swaney, "he could have written an appraisal of the loyalty of the Methodist Episcopal church, South, which with all due regard to the facts would have rivalled the statement of President Lincoln to the General Conference of 1864."³⁵ *The New Orleans Christian Advocate* said: "The truth is, it is a religious war. It is a defense of the rights of conscience."³⁶ *The Owachita Conference Journal* urged the people to "war against unbelief, lying, cheating, abolitionism, whiskey and the devil; and in humble faith anticipate the day when the land shall have her rest and be overspread by a Sabbath Day of holiness."³⁷ Dr. Carnes, editor of the *Texas Christian Advocate*, commanded a regiment made up primarily of Methodist preachers and laymen.³⁸ *The New Orleans Christian Advocate* was merely voicing the universal sentiment of Southern churchmen when it wrote: "Southern people feel profoundly that . . . they are fighting for the only true Christian civilization they can ever enjoy. . . . Slavery is rapidly coming to be regarded as a provi-

³⁵C. B. Swaney, *Episcopal Methodism and Slavery*, p. 311.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 313.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 313.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 316.

dential system of African civilization. . . . Southern men defend slavery now upon the same principles and with the same spirit as they do their religion, their homes, their wives and children, their personal honour and independence."³⁹

In 1882 an English translation of Dr. H. Martensen's two-volume work on *Christian Ethics* was published. Nowhere else do we find a more outspoken defense of war than in these pages. The author was Bishop of Seeland and an influential Christian leader. Here is what he says about war:

"It is, however, a necessary evil, and one based upon a divine ordinance. . . . The combatant should know that he is subserving a divine ordinance. *It is not his business to investigate whether the war in which he is fighting is a just or an unjust one.* The responsibility lies upon those who have resolved upon war. His concern is to show fidelity and bravery. . . . It is, however, a delusion to suppose that war can ever be abolished, for then we must know also how to banish sin and injustice from the world."⁴⁰

The attitude of the churches toward the World War will be discussed in the next chapter.

After a serious study of this whole problem, the historian Westermarck records the opinion that "it would be impossible to find a single instance of a war waged by a Protestant country, from any motive, to which the bulk of its clergy have not given their sanction and support. The opposition against war has

³⁹C. B. Swaney, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

⁴⁰Vol. 2, pp. 231-238.

generally come from other quarters. . . . War is in our days, as it was in those of Erasmus, so much sanctioned by authority and custom, that it is deemed impious to bear testimony against it.”⁴¹

Another historian who examined the record carefully said:

“In looking back, with our present experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that not only has ecclesiastical influence had no appreciable effect in diminishing the number of wars, but that it has actually and very seriously increased it. We may look in vain for any period since Constantine, in which the clergy, as a body, exerted themselves to repress the military spirit, or to prevent or abridge a particular war. . . . With the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries.”⁴²

Not only have leaders of the churches sanctioned the various wars waged by Christian countries during the past sixteen hundred years, ecclesiastics have often been in the front of the fighting. We have seen how priests and bishops and popes led the Crusades and the various wars of religion. John X was the first of the warrior popes to lead his troops in battle.⁴³ When Charlemagne was crowned by Pope Leo III on Christmas Day, 800, before the altar of St. Peter's, Lavisee says that “Christianity seemed like a society of soldiers and priests governed by a soldier and a

⁴¹*Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 362, 365.

⁴²W. E. H. Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 269, 270.

⁴³Philip Schaff, *History of The Christian Church*, Vol. 4, p. 285.

priest.”⁴⁴ During the age of feudalism, inmates of monasteries frequently participated in private wars. “There was always a general feeling,” says Henry Osborn Taylor, “often embodied in law or custom, that a Church dignitary should fight by another’s sword or spear. But this did not prevent bishop and abbot in countless instances in France, England, Germany and Spain, from riding mail-clad under their seignorial banner at the head of their forces.”⁴⁵

The monks of Subiaco “led armies and stormed rival castles, in pursuance of their own monastic feuds, like any lay prince.”⁴⁶ Concerning the situation in Germany in the Tenth Century, it is said that “the king lived in no inconsiderable degree, upon the revenues of the church and fought his wars in large party with church vassals. . . . In the tenth century *the art of war became an important episcopal accompaniment.*”⁴⁷ Churches were frequently fortified, the use of church towers as fortresses being common throughout Europe. In at least a few cases cathedrals were occupied as barracks. The Archbishop of Mainz “once slew nine foemen with his own hand, but not with the sword; for ‘that would have been contrary to Christ’s word to Peter,’ but with a club.”⁴⁸ King Philip’s chief of staff at Bouvines was a bishop, while Bishop Odo of Bayens fought at Hastings.⁴⁹ The Archbishop of Sens was killed in the battle of

⁴⁴G. H. Perris, *A Short History of War and Peace*, p. 86.

⁴⁵*The Mediæval Mind*, Vol. 1, p. 489.

⁴⁶Coulton, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 36.

⁴⁷J. W. Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, pp. 32, 39.

⁴⁸*British Quarterly Review*, Vol. 73 (1881), p. 87.

⁴⁹Wm. Stearns Davis, *Life on a Mediæval Barony*, p. 382.

Agincourt.⁵⁰ In the Eighteenth Century the Archbishop of Salzburg maintained a standing army of one thousand men.⁵¹

During the past three centuries many of the most famous soldiers have been devout Christians. The addresses of Oliver Cromwell to his armies and to Parliament, for example, abound in references to God and His protecting care. Cromwell is often called the "King of the Puritans" and it is said that "the period of his ascendancy was a time of religious fervour and activity such as had never been known in England before." Yet it was this religious zealot who, following the massacre of Drogheda, wrote to the President of the Council of State: "It hath pleased God to bless our endeavours at Tredah (Drogheda). . . . I believe we put to the sword the whole number of the defendants. I do not think thirty of the whole number escaped with their lives. This hath been a marvellous great mercy. . . . I wish that all honest hearts may give the glory of this to God alone."⁵² To the admiral in command he wrote that the expedition which captured Jamaica was "for the glory of God and the good of this nation. . . . I pray you set up your banners in the name of Christ; for undoubtedly it is His cause."⁵³

One of the most popular British soldiers of the last century was "Chinese" Gordon. Before his tragic

⁵⁰ Henry Hallam, *History of Europe During the Middle Ages*, Vol. 1, p. 163.

⁵¹ S. Baring-Gould, *The Church in Germany*, p. 367.

⁵² *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, edited by Thomas Carlyle, Vol. 2, pp. 171, 172 (English Edition of 1870).

⁵³ G. R. S. Taylor, *Modern English Statesmen*, p. 64.

death at the siege of Khartum he had seen military service in the Crimea, China, India, South Africa, and Egypt. Gladstone once referred to him as "A hero of heroes." This roving soldier of fortune was deeply religious. His long and numerous letters read like sermons. His diary and even his reports abound in references to God and the Bible. That war is unjustifiable for a Christian seems never to have occurred to him. He once wrote to his sister: "There is only one sin, and that is unbelief."⁵⁴

By common consent Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson are two of the most gallant gentlemen America has ever known and both rank high as generals and tacticians. Without reservation they devoted themselves to the cause of the Confederacy. General Lee was known to dismount and kneel in prayer on the battle field with shells bursting about him. General Jackson and his staff were accustomed to evening devotions. So strictly did the latter observe the Sabbath in peace time that he would not even mail a letter on Sunday. And yet it was he who said: "Tell the Colonel he need not ask me how to deal with mutineers. Shoot them where they stand." And in response to an inquiry as to how he proposed to deal with an overwhelming enemy force, he said: "Kill them, sir! Kill every man."⁵⁵

Theodore Roosevelt was at the same time a valiant soldier and a devout Christian. The latter years of his life were devoted to the cause of military preparedness. He saw no contradiction between religion

⁵⁴*Letters of General C. G. Gordon to His Sister*, p. 146.

⁵⁵Allen Tate, *Stonewall Jackson, The Good Soldier*, pp. 128, 274.

and war. Indeed, he ransacked the dictionary for words of vituperation with which to berate pacifists who were opposed to armed preparedness and war. His volume, *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*, is one of the ablest appeals on behalf of a larger army and navy that has ever been written.

But why continue? Whole libraries could be filled with volumes by and about Christian warriors. At no time during the past sixteen hundred years has the total number of Christians who refused to sanction or participate in war constituted more than an infinitesimal fraction of the entire church membership in the respective nations.

2. PERSECUTION BY CHRISTIANS

(1) *Early Theological Controversies*

By the Fifth Century Christianity had become an intricate system of beliefs. Orthodoxy was determined by credal standards far more than by ethical conduct or religious experience. Opinion about Jesus transcended in importance the following of his example. Theology supplanted ethics and religion.

The first civil war which rent Christendom was that between the two factions in the Donatist controversy. For a whole century it consumed the churches of North Africa. The quarrel arose out of a contested election of Cæcilian as Bishop of Carthage. The followers of Donatus, a Numidian bishop, refused to recognize Cæcilian on the ground that he had been consecrated by Felix, Bishop of Apthunga, a famous Traditor, i.e., one who had delivered up the sacred vessels and writings of the church to the

Romans during the persecution. The Donatists elected Majorinus and the war was on. Pitched battles occurred. Three councils decided in favour of Cæcilian but his opponents refused to yield. Upon the death of Majorinus a second Donatus was elected as their leader. The Donatists were exiled and their property confiscated. They retaliated with violence and atrocities. A Roman general, Ursacius, was killed. The Circumcellions, a sect of the Donatists, refused to use swords because Christ had forbidden Peter to use this weapon, but they took up huge clubs with which they beat their victims to death. They "not merely abused the privileges of war by the most licentious outrages on the females, but were attended by troops of drunken prostitutes, whom they called their sacred virgins."⁵⁶

For three hundred years violent controversies concerning the nature of Christ raged throughout Christendom. In what sense was he God? For centuries the energies of the church were consumed in endless wrangling over this question. In the earlier stages the leaders were Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, and his successor Athanasius on the one side, and Arius on the other. The formula of Bishop Alexander was that Christ was "always God, always Son, at the same time Father, at the same time Son, the Son exists unbegotten with the Father, everlastingly, uncreated, neither in conception nor in any smallest point does God excel the Son, always God, always Son, from God Himself the Son."⁵⁷ The doctrine of

⁵⁶ H. H. Milman, *History of Christianity*, Vol. 2, p. 377.

⁵⁷ A. Harnack, *The History of Dogma*, Vol. 4, p. 12.

Arius is given by Harnack as follows: "God, the Only One, beside whom there is no other, is alone unbegotten, without beginning and eternal; He is inexpressible, incomprehensible, and has absolutely no equal. . . . As regards his Substance the 'Son' . . . has neither one and the same substance together with the Father, nor a nature and constitution similar to that of the Father. If he had, then there would be two Gods. . . . Still the Son is not a creature and a product like other creatures; he is the perfect creator; by him everything has been created; he stands in a special relation to God, but this is solely conditioned by grace and adoption."⁵⁸

In the effort to settle this solemn question as to whether Christ was consubstantial with God or merely the unique Son of God and creator of the world, Constantine, himself as yet unbaptized and still half pagan, called the famous Council of Nicæa in 325, the First General Council of the church.⁵⁹ Approximately three hundred bishops came together, most of them from the East, each bringing two presbyters and three servants, all expenses being paid by the emperor. This highest of church assemblies was opened under the honorary presidency of the emperor, adorned with many gems and seated on the golden throne prepared for him. And only thirty years previously Christians were being hunted like wild beasts throughout the empire! In the end orthodoxy won—that is, it was orthodoxy because it won. Arius and two bishops were banished and branded

⁵⁸ A. Harnack, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, pp. 15, 17, 19.

⁵⁹ See A. P. Stanley, *History of the Eastern Church*, Lectures 2-5.

as enemies of Christianity. But this did not end the controversy. Arianism quickly revived and by 381 was accepted by nine tenths of Eastern Christendom. The orthodox victory was not made permanent until after Athanasius himself had been banished five times! Throughout the half century during which this controversy raged scenes of indescribable violence occurred repeatedly. In Alexandria a mob led by Arians "invaded the church of St. Thomas; a young man in woman's clothing danced on the altar; another young man sat naked in the bishop's chair, from which he openly preached immorality to a crowd that roared with laughter at what they took to be a fine joke; virgins of the church were stripped, scourged, violated."⁶⁰

The Emperor Constantinus issued an edict to the effect that those persons who refused to take communion from the hands of Arian bishops should have their mouths "held open by a wooden engine while the consecrated bread was forced down their throat; the breasts of tender virgins were either burnt with red-hot egg-shells, or inhumanly compressed between sharp and heavy boards."⁶¹ In 390 by an edict of Theodosius pagan worship was forbidden and the act of sacrificing animals before an inanimate idol was pronounced high treason and punishable by death.⁶² In 530 as a result of theological controversies, "respectable citizens, noble matrons, and consecrated virgins were stripped naked and raised in the air by

⁶⁰W. F. Adeny, *The Greek and Eastern Church*, p. 67.

⁶¹Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 2, p. 315.

⁶²*Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 135.

pulleys, with a weight suspended at their feet. In this painful attitude their naked bodies were torn with scourges, or burnt with red-hot plates of iron. The amputation of the ears, the nose, the tongue, and the right hand was afflicted by the Arians." The historian Ammianus Marcellinus was of the opinion that "the enmity of the Christians towards each other surpassed the fury of savage beasts against man." When Damasus was elected Pope the riots were so fierce that one hundred and thirty-seven corpses were found in one of the churches.

In 431 the Third General Council of the church was assembled at Ephesus by the emperor Theodosius II in an effort to settle the bitter controversy between Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria, and Nestorius. The latter protested against the current practice of designating the Virgin Mary as "Mother of God." The character of Cyril, who was later canonized by the church, is indicated by the fact that he had acquiesced in the brutal murder of the learned and beautiful Hypatia, who was dragged from her carriage by monks, stripped of her clothes, her flesh scraped from bones with oyster shells, and her mangled body thrown into a fire.⁶³ At this council Nestorius was banished and his followers hounded out of the empire. All this in spite of the fact, as Dean Milman says, "never was there a case in which the contending parties approximated so closely."

Eighteen years later another council met at Ephesus, later designated "Robber Council" by Leo I, and was characterized by shameful conduct on the

⁶³ See Adeney, *op. cit.*, p. 96; also Charles Kingsley's famous novel.

part of the Christian officials present. If any person dared uphold "two natures," he was met with cries: "Nestorian! Tear him asunder. Burn him alive. As he divides, so let him be divided." The Patriarch of Constantinople, Flavian, was so viciously kicked and mauled by the Patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscurus, and other clerical opponents that he died a few days later.

Following the Council of Chalcedon in 451, a prolonged struggle with the Monophysite heresy rent the church. These heretics affirmed that Christ was "of two natures," but denied that he existed "in two natures." Concerning this controversy, Professor W. F. Adeney says, "Here was a fine point of theology, so difficult to determine that only an expert could state it correctly, and yet it divided cities into furious factions with howling mobs and fatal riots." The orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, Proterius, was murdered in his own baptistry by followers of his rival Timothy. His body was dragged through the streets and then hacked to pieces, the remains being burned. Some years later in Constantinople the orthodox party retaliated by carrying about the head of a Monophysite monk on a pole, crying, "See the head of an enemy of the Trinity."⁶⁴

The classic and final form of the orthodox interpretation of the Trinity is found in the so-called Athanasian Creed, although it was not written by Athanasius. It probably originated in the Fifth Century in Gaul and gradually spread over the whole of Latin Christendom. After the Reformation it was

⁶⁴Adeney, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

adopted by various Protestant churches. Luther regarded it as "the most important and glorious composition since the days of the apostles." Salvation was made conditional upon its acceptance. In the forty-four articles of this creed, five warnings are given that salvation depends upon correct beliefs; acceptance of such ideas as these: "The Father is made of none; neither created; nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created; but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son: not made; neither created; nor begotten; but proceeding. . . . And in this Trinity none is before or after another: none is greater or less than another. But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal. So that in all things, as aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity. . . . For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ. Who suffered for our salvation; descended into hades: rose again the third day from the dead. . . . This is the catholic faith; which except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved." Those who refused to believe that Christ descended into Hades were doomed to hell fire! "A literature arose," says Lecky, "surpassing in its mendacious ferocity any other the world has ever known. The polemical writers habitually painted as dæmons those who diverged from the orthodox belief, gloated with a vindictive piety over the sufferings of the heretic upon earth, as upon a Divine punishment, and sometimes, with an almost superhuman malice . . . exulted in

no ambiguous terms on the tortures which they believed to be reserved for him for ever.”⁶⁵ A history of the patriarchs of Constantinople reveals many casualties. A total of 95 have reigned for less than one year. Of the 328 occupants of the office up to 1884 only 137 closed their term by natural death; 41 resigned, three were poisoned, two murdered, one beheaded, one blinded, one drowned, one hanged, one strangled.⁶⁶

Throughout this period there were undoubtedly many pious and devoted Christians who incarnated the virtues of their Lord. It would be easy to exaggerate and distort the vices of the church. Nevertheless, the evidence is overwhelming that the kind of Christianity exhibited in the writings and conduct of many theologians and ecclesiastics from the Fourth Century onward is utterly different from the religion of Jesus himself. They appropriated the title and rejected the content of his message.

(2) *The Inquisition*

For several centuries the Christian church systematically used torture in dealing with heretics. This was true of Protestants and Catholics alike. The latter used violence against disbelievers more frequently than the former, chiefly because the Catholic church was older and had more opportunities. Both were guilty of unspeakable barbarities.

Before proceeding with a consideration of the reasons for the establishment of the Inquisition and the methods made use of, it may be well to remind our-

⁶⁵ W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol. 2, p. 211.

⁶⁶ C. D. Cobham, *The Patriarchs of Constantinople*, pp. 7, 8.

selves that all over Europe down to the end of the Eighteenth Century criminals were accorded utterly barbarous treatment.⁶⁷ Human ingenuity exhausted itself in perfecting instruments of torture, every conceivable device for inflicting pain being used. In some sections women were burned or buried alive for simple felonies, while men were boiled to death for counterfeiting. Hanging, drawing and quartering were common penalties. Late in the Seventeenth Century blasphemers were beheaded. Jews were sometimes hung by the feet between two savage dogs. Down to the early decades of the Nineteenth Century there were more than one hundred capital offenses in England. Some years ago the Earl of Shrewsbury opened for public exhibition his famous collection of instruments of torture, every specimen of which had a gruesome history. The catalogue of this exhibition describes six hundred and fifty instruments. Just to read the list is sufficient to send cold shivers up and down one's spine: spiked collars, flesh pinchers, thumbscrews, branding irons, iron whips, tongue-tearers, torture stocks, iron spiders for disemboweling, cat-o'-nine-tails, pear-shaped gags, choking ropes, mouth openers, torture ladder, wheels for breaking joints, stretching gallows, torture chairs, and the famous iron maiden whose embrace gouged out the victim's eyes and impaled his body upon numerous sharp prongs.⁶⁸ The age was characterized by extreme callousness and cruelty. Human life was cheap.

⁶⁷ See George Ives, *A History of Penal Methods*.

⁶⁸ A copy of this catalogue is on file in the New York Public Library.

*The Inquisition was founded as an instrument of mercy and as a rule was administered by men of the purest intent and most ardent zeal.*⁶⁹ Christians who believe in capital punishment should not find it difficult to understand the motives of the Inquisitors. In that day heresy was regarded as a greater crime than treason. All the arguments in favour of hanging a murderer or a traitor seemed equally valid when applied to the burning of heretics. The belief was universal throughout Christendom that only orthodox members of the church could be saved. Jews, Mohammedans, heathen people in general, the unbaptized and apostates from the true faith, were all consigned to the flames of hell. No worse fate could possibly befall a man than to die outside the church. And no one could remain in the church unless he accepted the beliefs and practices of that institution. Pope Gregory XVI was entirely consistent with Catholic orthodoxy when he declared that the idea of freedom of conscience was "mad indifference flowing from the most foul fountain of indifference."⁷⁰ Any method seemed justifiable if its use would save a precious soul from hell fire. When persuasion failed coercion seemed necessary; when mild means were unavailing violence was deemed essential. Moreover, the heretic not only endangered his own soul, he was a menace to the temporal and spiritual welfare of others. It was regarded less reprehensible to kill a man's body than to destroy his soul by enticing him

⁶⁹For a modern Catholic interpretation, see A. L. Maycock. *The Inquisition* (1926).

⁷⁰Quoted by Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation*, p. 642.

into unbelief. And so for the good of the individual and the protection of society, the Inquisition was founded.

Throughout most of its history members of religious orders were intrusted exclusively with its administration. The Dominicans and Franciscans were especially favoured as Inquisitors. St. Francis Xavier, the famous missionary, once wrote to the King of Portugal: "The second need which India has in order that those who live in it may be good Christians is that your highness should send the Holy Inquisition." Rafael Sabatini tells us that Torquemada, one of the most relentless of all the Inquisitors, was "dauntless amid execrations, unmoved by plaudits, sublimely disdainful of temporal weal, in nothing so admirable as in the unfaltering self-abnegation with which he devoted himself to the service of God. . . . Such was the austerity of his character that he never ate meat, or used linen either in his clothing or on his bed." So saintly were some of these men that they were later canonized by the church. They were no more condemned by their contemporaries than soldiers are when they kill in battle. Indeed, the populace often spurred them on to greater zeal.

A modern Catholic writer points out the impossibility of understanding the Inquisition unless one remembers that "there are many men who conscientiously hold that orthodox dogmatic belief is the pearl of great price for which all other things in the world ought to be sacrificed."⁷¹ Pope Pius VII de-

⁷¹ Herbert Thompson, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 9, p. 453.

clared in 1816 that Bible societies were "a fiendish instrument for the undermining of the foundation of religion."⁷² A decade later Pope Leo XII said that anyone separate from the Roman Catholic church "has no part in eternal life." In 1895 Carl Mirbt, a prelate of the Papal household, eulogized the Inquisition in these words: "O blessed flame of those pyres by which a very few crafty and insignificant persons were taken away that hundreds of hundreds of phalanxes of souls should be saved from the jaws of error and eternal damnation! O noble and venerable memory of Torquemada!"⁷³

And so for centuries a reign of terror prevailed. The faithful were obliged to inform the authorities of any suspected heretic. Mothers were required to be informants against heretical sons; wives were bound to disclose the apostasy of their husbands. Toleration of heresy was regarded as the worst of all sins. Pity and compassion for the disbelievers were looked upon as sinful. Indeed, the faithful were taught to rejoice in the anguish of the victim. Centuries earlier Gregory the Great had argued that "the bliss of the elect in heaven would not be perfect unless they were able to look across the abyss and enjoy the agonies of their brethren in eternal fire."⁷⁴

The accused was not assumed innocent until proved guilty; quite the reverse, he must prove his innocence. Witnesses for the defense were rare. Few dared to risk their lives by appearing on behalf of an

⁷² Herbert Thompson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 9, p. 755.

⁷³ Quoted by Preserved Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 643.

⁷⁴ H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition*, Vol. 1, pp. 240, 241.

accused person. The sources of the charges against the accused were usually kept secret. Trickery and deceit were frequently practised by the ecclesiastical court. Torture was a normal procedure. Every horrible device that the human mind could devise was made use of. A modern Catholic writer says: "In general it would seem that the Inquisition employed the same methods of torture as the secular courts."⁷⁵ If all other means failed, the victim was disposed of by slow starvation or burning at the stake. Use of the fagot was justified on the ground that it is better to burn here than hereafter!

The statement is frequently made that the inquisitorial court or the church never condemned a heretic to death, the guilty person simply being turned over to the secular arm for punishment. To put it mildly this is a legal fiction; to speak bluntly it is sheer hypocrisy. The church not only knew what the action of the state would be, it uttered dire threats against any ruler who refused to execute the prisoner handed over for punishment. Long after Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Clement IV, Nicholas IV, Boniface VIII, and other popes had threatened to excommunicate any prince who refused to burn the guilty person, the ancient recommendation to the state "to act with moderation and avoid all effusion of blood and danger of death" was adhered to. Even Pilate washed his hands of all responsibility!

The simplest of all the devices of torture was the hoist or pulley. The arms of the victim were raised as far behind him as they would go, the rope was

⁷⁵ Maycock, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

attached to his wrists and the whole weight of his body was thrown upon his straining arms. Sometimes heavy weights were tied to his feet, and after being pulled up to the ceiling, he was allowed to drop a few feet with a jerk. This was often continued for two or three hours unless a confession was made sooner.

The water torture "appears to have been greatly favoured by the Holy Office." The victim was tied to a ladder with his head below the level of his feet. The whipcord was tied so tightly that it cut into his flesh, with a stick twisted between the cord and the flesh. His mouth was pried open with a prong of iron; a long strip of linen was forced down his throat, down which water was slowly poured. And so for the love of Christ he was strangled or asphyxiated! Scourging was widely practised by the inquisitors. Tongues were sometimes torn out; branding of the human face was not unknown; drowning was another method used in disposing of heretics. The victim was sometimes made to walk on hot irons or have the soles of his feet roasted.

Imprisonment in foul dungeons was perhaps the most common way of exterminating heretics. Suspected persons were sometimes detained for years before they were brought to trial. Dr. H. C. Lea has recorded numerous illustrations of this practice.⁷⁶ In one case thirty years elapsed before the victim was given a formal hearing. In another instance where a woman made a confession of heresy, she was not

⁷⁶ Lea, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 419 ff.

formally sentenced until three decades later. When it is recalled that the prisons of the Middle Ages were horribly unsanitary and that inmates were ordinarily fed almost solely upon bread and water, one gets at least a faint conception of the frightful toll of human life taken by the Inquisition.

Even more terrible, if possible, was the fate of those who were burned at the stake. The person who had been adjudged guilty was tied to a pillar, inflammables were piled up to his neck and ignited. Then the half-charred body was hacked into pieces and thrown on a log fire. In Spain alone from two thousand to eight thousand men and women perished in the flames of the Inquisition. Concerning the persecution of heretics in France, Principal Fairbairn of Mansfield College, Oxford, says, "The Roman amphitheater was, compared with the Place Maubert, a home of mild humanity; the gay and careless intolerance of Francis I had nothing to learn from pagan hate, while the Inquisition was a fiercer and more pitiless foe than heathenism could have bred."⁷⁷

The relentlessness of the Inquisitors against heretics was not confined to the living; they frequently proceeded against the dead also. For a minor offense the bones of the deceased were dug up and cast out; for a serious apostasy, his bones were burned. A Thirteenth Century writer describes how the bodies of certain heretics were exhumed, "their bones and stinking corpses" being dragged through the streets and then burned "in honour of God and of the blessed

⁷⁷*Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. 2, p. 347.

Mary His mother, and the blessed Dominic His servant."⁷⁸

(3) *Use of Violence by Protestants*

One of the strangest anomalies of history is found in the fact that victims of oppression often became persecutors themselves at the first opportunity. Again and again this has happened. The Jews sought to stamp out early Christianity and in turn they have been harassed and hounded all over Christendom for many generations. In less than five decades after the worst period of persecution of Christians by the Romans the former became relentless in their antagonism to pagans. In later centuries the reformers were doomed if they fell into the hands of Catholic ecclesiastics; but they, too, often became persecutors the moment they had power of life and death over their opponents.⁷⁹

Freedom was the watchword of Martin Luther in his early days. His theology rested upon the foundation of the right of private judgment, and he boldly proclaimed the "universal priesthood of all Christians." During the first stages of the Reformation he was vigorously opposed to the persecution of heretics or Catholics. Even during his later years he upheld the theoretical right of freedom in religious beliefs and practices. His own conduct, however, often departed widely from his abstract teaching. He became a staunch advocate of compulsory attendance at

⁷⁸Lea, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 553.

⁷⁹See Mathew Carey, *Letters on Religious Persecution*, for a long list of Catholic victims of Protestant persecution.

Lutheran services. In practice he was often bitterly intolerant of his opponents.⁸⁰ As early as 1520 he raised the question why—if murderers are punished with death—why not “wash our hands in the blood” of cardinals and popes. He resorted to vehement and obscene language in characterizing his foes. “Oh, that our Right Reverend Cardinals, Popes and Roman Legates had more Kings of England to put them to death,” he wrote following the execution of Thomas More. In 1540 he said: “If I had all the Franciscan friars in one house, I would set fire to it, for, in the monks the good seed is gone, and only the chaff is left. To the fire with them!”⁸¹ He was also unsparing in his abuse of other Protestants with whom he had quarrelled. He once declared that certain opponents were “scourges of the sacrament compared with whose madness the papists are mild.” He referred to Erasmus as “that reptile,” and “an instrument of Satan.” He called Zwingli “my Judas.” He once said that Carlstadt and Zwingli were “not only liars, but the very incarnation of lying, deceit and hypocrisy.”

Luther frequently urged the secular authorities “to oppose false teachers.” He was especially insistent that Catholic worship in the collegiate church of Wittenberg be prevented. He favoured banishment for Catholics who remained steadfast to their faith, and in 1530 signed a memorandum drafted by Melanchthon which justified the setting up of a regular system of coercion and the use of the death

⁸⁰For a mass of evidence on this point by a scholarly Catholic writer, see Hartmann Grisar, *Luther*, Vol. 4, pp. 306-326; Vol. 6, pp. 239-289.

⁸¹Grisar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 247.

penalty for the most dangerous heretics or blasphemers. Concerning this point a Protestant theologian says: "The death-penalty for heresy rested on the highest Lutheran authority."⁸²

John Calvin likewise was guilty of intemperate language and cruel practices. He once confessed: "Bile had taken such possession of me that I poured out bitterness on every side." He goaded his Geneva opponents into the most violent hatred; he engaged in a constant warfare of words with other reformers. He shared the common opinion of the day that those persons who practised witchcraft and "sold themselves body and soul to the devil" were worthy of death. After fifteen women had been burned in 1545 and twenty-five men were on trial, Calvin "begged that their sufferings should be as brief as possible." The executioner was, therefore, urged to do his work quickly. First, the hands of the victims were chopped off; then they were burned alive in the Plain Palais.⁸³ The use of torture in extreme cases was justified by the Geneva reformer. When François Daniel was being tried Calvin wrote to Farel: "We shall see in a couple of days, I hope, what the torture will wring from him."⁸⁴ One of Calvin's most bitter enemies, Filibert Berthelier, was condemned to death by the Council, his body being quartered and exhibited in four sections of the town as a warning.

The crowning illustration is found in the zeal with which Calvin hounded Servetus to his death. As a

⁸² Walther Kohler, quoted by Grisar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 266.

⁸³ Hugh Y. Reyburn, *John Calvin*, p. 129.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

result of his ferocious prosecution the Spaniard was found guilty of heresy on three primary charges: denying the Trinity, declaring that infant baptism was an invention of the devil, and attacking the doctrines of the church of Geneva. During the trial Calvin called Servetus a "villainous cur" because he denied that Palestine was a land flowing with milk and honey. No charge was too petty to be overlooked. When condemnatory replies were received from the churches of Bern, Zurich, Basel, and Schaffhauser, the Geneva Council sentenced Servetus to the stake. On October 27, 1553, the torch was lighted and in half an hour the spectators were satisfied. There is plenty of evidence that Calvin did not ask for nor desire death by burning. On the other hand, he certainly was responsible for the arrest and merciless persecution of Servetus and for the death sentence. Moreover, one of his biographers tells us that he "never regretted the part he played in the case." Indeed, he wrote a passionate defense of the execution. "In this book," says Mr. Reyburn, "there is not an argument which might not have been used by Torquemada or any other Inquisitor."⁸⁵ Most of the leading reformers applauded the execution of Servetus. Melancthon, Luther's learned co-worker, wrote: "I thank the Son of God, who has given you the prize of victory. The Church now and hereafter owes and will owe you her gratitude. . . . It is a pious and memorable example to all posterity." Luther went so far as to rejoice over the death of Zwingli: "God knows the thoughts of the heart. It is well that Zwingli, Carl-

⁸⁵ Hugh Y. Reyburn, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

stadt, and Pellicanus lie dead on the battle field. . . . Oh, what a triumph is this, that they have perished! God indeed knows His business well.”⁸⁶

The Roman Catholics list two hundred and fifty-three martyrs in England from 1535 to 1681. Burning at the stake, hanging, and quartering were used by Henry VIII in disposing of clergymen who denied his supremacy over the church. Dorothy Trask died in 1645 after having spent fifteen years in prison for the crime of regarding Saturday as the Sabbath.⁸⁷ Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians, and other dissenters were punished ruthlessly. When Å. Lasco and his followers were driven out of England they were successively refused permission to land by the Lutheran authorities of Elsinore, Copenhagen, Rostock, Lübeck, and Hamburg; whereupon Calvin wrote, “Great God, what barbarity among a Christian people. It surpasses the fury of the waves.”⁸⁸

During the reign of Henry VIII a law was enacted which provided a penalty of death by burning for the offense of denying that the sacraments of the Communion are “the very flesh of Christ” and “the very blood of Christ.”⁸⁹ Queen Elizabeth assented to an article which declared that “a Christian government may lawfully punish heretics with death.” During her reign several dissenting clergymen were burned at the stake. Obstinate refusal to attend divine services for a period of four months was punishable with

⁸⁶ Grisar, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 384.

⁸⁷ *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 9, p. 758.

⁸⁸ Reyburn, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

⁸⁹ Carey, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

death. The sentence pronounced upon persons found guilty of aiding or harbouring a priest included these words: "You are to be severally hanged by the neck; that you severally be cut down alive . . . that your bowels be taken out and burned in your view; that your heads be severed from your bodies; that your bodies be divided into four quarters . . . and the God of infinite mercy have mercy upon your souls."⁹⁰ Under Charles II Roman Catholics were forbidden to go farther than five miles from home under penalty of banishment and the further penalty of death if they returned without permission. In England after 1612 it was found more expedient, writes Thomas Fuller, that heretics "should silently and privately waste away in prisons, rather than to grace them and amuze others with the solemnity of a public execution." In Scotland, however, Thomas Aikenhead, a boy of eighteen, was executed for blasphemy as late as 1697.

It would be natural to suppose that the Puritans, who fled to America in order that they might worship God freely, were ardent believers in religious toleration. Such was far from the case, however. They established theocracies and the whole weight of church and state was thrown against dissenters. Heretics were placed in the stocks, lodged in jail, whipped behind ox-carts, maimed, banished, or executed. In 1660 four Quakers were hanged in Boston.

Roger Williams was banished from Salem in 1636 for advocating separation of church and state and

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

other "crimes." Lady Deborah Moody was excommunicated and compelled to leave Salem because she declared that "the baptizing of infants is no ordinance of God." A man named Painter was publicly whipped for refusing to permit his child to be baptized. The famous preacher, John Cotton, affirmed that "denying infants' baptism would overthrow all; and this was a capital offense; and therefore they were soul murderers." Henry Dunster was compelled to resign as president of Harvard College in 1654 for opposing infant baptism. A Massachusetts Act of 1646 provided a penalty of banishment for all who denied the immortality of the soul or the need of repentance. Penalties for "denying the true God" included whipping and boring the tongue with a hot iron. Roman Catholics were not allowed to live in the colony, and Jesuits were threatened with death if they returned after banishment. The penalty for blasphemy in Rhode Island was death.

The Puritans of New England were especially hostile to Quakers. A Massachusetts law of 1657 inflicted a fine of one hundred pounds on anyone who should bring a Quaker into the colony; forty shillings for every hour that one was entertained or concealed. If a Quaker should return after having been banished, the penalty for the first offense was to have an ear cropped; for the second offense, the other ear; for the third, to have his tongue bored with a hot iron. If the offender was a woman she was to be severely whipped and on the third offense to have her tongue bored.⁹¹ Under this law Christopher Holder

⁹¹Rufus M. Jones, *Quakers in the American Colonies*, p. 70.

and John Copeland each lost an ear. Because Catherine Scott criticized the penalty of ear cropping she was severely whipped. An aged Friend, William Brend, was tortured with one hundred and seventeen blows on his bare back with a tarred rope. The fact that Elizabeth Hooton had received a warrant from the King permitting her to buy land in Massachusetts in which to harbour Friends did not prevent the New England authorities from bitterly persecuting this woman who was nearing seventy years of age. She was tied to a cart tail and ordered beaten through eleven towns. She survived the terrible ordeal of being driven half-naked through the snow for a distance of eighty miles and the infliction of one hundred and ten lashes.⁹² In 1659 in a list of sufferings presented by the Quakers to the King are the following: two honest and innocent women stripped stark naked and searched in an inhuman manner; one laid neck and heels in irons for sixteen hours; one branded with the letter H; three had their right ears chopped off; two ordered sold as bondslaves. William Robinson and Marmaduke Stephenson were hanged in Boston. The next year Mary Dyer and William Leddra met the same fate.

The early settlers in Virginia and the Carolinas were likewise intolerant. Governor Dale, whose term of office began in 1611, drew up a code of laws which provided the death penalty for all who spoke impiously of the Trinity and for the third offense of Sabbath breaking. Failure to attend religious services was punished on the second occasion by whipping

⁹² Mary Agnes Best, *Rebel Saints*, p. 252.

and on the third by labour in the galleys for six months. There is no evidence, however, that the heaviest penalties were ever executed. In 1642 Roman Catholics were disfranchised and priests were expelled. Nonconformist ministers were banished. Shipmasters were forbidden to accept Quaker passengers under penalty of a five-hundred-dollar fine. If Quakers returned after a third banishment they were to be treated as felons. Notwithstanding the fact that many ministers of the established church were "profane swearers, brawlers, drunkards, gamblers, and licentious," no other clergymen were allowed in the colony. In 1772 two men, Mosley and Shelton, were thrown into jail and given thirty-one stripes for baptizing a child.

(4) *Massacre of the Jews*

The record of the persecution by Christians of the race that produced Moses and Isaiah and Jesus constitutes one of the most ghastly stories in all history. The Bible was written by Jews and most of its heroes are Israelites. The debt of Christianity to the Hebrews is incomparably greater than to any other race. Yet toward no other people have Christians shown such implacable hatred over so long a period. Judging by centuries of zeal in slaughtering Jews, one might conclude that Christians had never so much as heard of the brotherhood of man or the law of love.⁹³

The period of persecution begins with the accession

⁹³ For a summary of the evidence see Gustav Pearlson, *Twelve Centuries of Jewish Persecution*; Leopold Zung, *The Suffering of the Jews During the Middle Ages*; and Lewis Browne, *Stranger Than Fiction*.

of Christians to power and ends with a day which has not yet dawned. Pagans have never pursued their foes with more relentless ferocity than has been manifested by Christians at intermittent intervals throughout a millennium. Sometimes the fire has died down but it has never gone out; some incident or emotion has fanned the flames of bigotry and multitudes of Jews have been consumed. Almost everywhere in Christendom Jews have been regarded as the scum of the earth and treated with contempt and brutality. Segregation in the foulest portion of the city was for long periods a regular procedure. Times without number banishment has been decreed. Mob violence has occurred with sickening frequency. Systematic annihilation has many times been planned and often executed. Not until 1791 were Jews placed on a footing of equality before the law in any European country.

The Fifth and Sixth centuries were especially gloomy years for Jews. Harried from place to place, systematically hunted down, an unnumbered multitude perished. The golden age of Jewish learning in Spain was followed by a holocaust. Jews were the first victims of the Crusades. Long before the hosts of righteousness reached the Holy Land they spilled the blood of the ungodly. In Worms almost all of the eight hundred Jewish residents were butchered; in Mayence the number rose to a thousand. Many Jews sought the more merciful death of suicide; mothers killed their own children rather than permit them to fall into the hands of Christians. In 1207 Pope Innocent III ordered a crusade against Jews and Albi-

gences. In his message to the kings and princes the Pope wrote: "The Jews are doomed to everlasting slavery for the crucifixion of Christ by their ancestors . . . It is the duty of Christian rulers, so far from protecting them, to treat them as slaves and keep them apart from their Christian subjects, as is right for an inferior caste, devoid of human rights and scarcely to be tolerated."⁹⁴

A common custom arose of compelling Jews to wear a special badge—a mark of shame—when they appeared on the street. During the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth centuries banishment was the order of the day. Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1222 decreed that "Christians shall not hold communication with the Jews, or sell them food under pain of excommunication." In 1320 all Jews were banished from England "forever," in 1394 from France for the third time, in 1492 from Spain. In the Fourteenth Century in the city of Deckendorf the tolling of the church bell was used as a signal for a massed attack on the Jews of that community. During the scourge of the Black Death the Jews were accused of having caused the pestilence and were slaughtered wholesale. All over Europe men, women, and children were consigned to the flames. In Prague they were given the alternative of being baptized or being burned. Those that refused to accept Christianity were butchered, their corpses stripped naked and then burned. In 1391 four thousand Jews of Seville were murdered or sold as slaves to Arab merchants.

⁹⁴Quoted by S. M. Doubnow, *An Outline of Jewish History*, Vol. 3, p. 99.

For the two and a quarter centuries following the rise of the Cossacks against their Polish overlords in 1648, the Jews of Eastern Europe never knew a decade of security. In the Seventeenth Century hundreds of thousands of Jews were slain. Nicholas I, who reigned from 1825 to 1855, used conscription into the army as a device for uprooting the Jewish religion. The term of service was for twenty-five years and boys of twelve were sometimes drafted. Conveyed to distant regions and separated from their own religionists, every possible pressure was brought to bear to cause them to abandon their faith. From 1881 to 1906 repeated massacres occurred throughout Russia. Thousands upon thousands of Jews were slaughtered in cold blood by the subjects of the Little Father of the Orthodox Church. In the course of a single week in October, 1905, there were fifty pogroms or massacres in that many communities. In Odessa more than three hundred Jews were slaughtered and the possessions of forty thousand Jews looted or destroyed. In no country in the world was the Christian church more dominant during the last decades of the Nineteenth Century than in Russia. The Czar was head of the church and received ecclesiastical support in all his acts of despotism and barbarism. From the prayer of forgiveness on the Cross to the fiendish persecution of Jews is a far cry!

(5) *Torture of Witches*

Throughout a period of fifteen hundred years, during which fifty generations of human beings passed across the stage of life, belief in witchcraft

flourished in all parts of Christendom. The conviction was quite universal that it was possible for an old woman to ride long distances through the air on a broomstick or a goat and to transform herself into a wolf and devour her neighbour's flock. It was generally believed that witches had entered into a compact with Satan and had been endowed with power to work diabolical miracles. Hail, thunder, plagues, and pestilences were supposed to be the work of evil spirits masquerading in human form. Ecclesiastical dignitaries with extraordinary unanimity denounced witchcraft; legislative authorities enacted laws against it; executioners sought to abolish it by shedding the blood of innumerable victims.⁹⁵

The Catholic church exerted its full strength in the effort to stamp out the hideous crime of witchcraft. Through every available channel it was taught that to spare a witch was a direct insult to God and gross disobedience of His commands. Bulls against witchcraft were promulgated by Innocent VIII, Julius II, and Adrian VI. In speaking of the bull against witches issued by Innocent VIII in 1484, President Andrew D. White said: "Of all documents ever issued from Rome, imperial or papal, this has doubtless, first and last, cost the greatest shedding of innocent blood. Yet no document was ever more clearly dictated by conscience. Inspired by the scriptural command 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live,' Pope Innocent exhorted the clergy of Germany to leave no means

⁹⁵ See. W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. 1, pp. 27-154.

untried to detect sorcerers.”⁹⁶ A countless number of councils anathematized it. Numerous books by monks and priests and bishops were hurled against it. Thomas Aquinas taught that diseases and tempests are the direct acts of the devil. Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, and one of the master-minds of his age, advocated the persecution of witches.

The leaders of Protestantism were not less credulous. Luther exclaimed: “I would have no compassion on these witches. I would burn them all.”⁹⁷ Twelve bishops sat upon the Commission which was responsible for an English law against witchcraft. Baxter, one of the greatest of the Puritans, ardently advocated extreme measures against those who practised the magic arts. The divines of New England were untiring in their efforts to uproot the evil. John Wesley declared that “giving up witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible.” As late as 1773 “the divines of the Associated Presbytery” of Scotland passed a resolution asserting their belief in witchcraft and deploring the prevailing skepticism concerning it.⁹⁸

Torture was regularly used in the trial of witches. Every fiendish device imaginable was used to extract confessions of guilt from suspected persons. Piercing with pins and needles was almost invariably practised. An iron bridle or hoop bound across the face of the suspected person, with two prongs thrust into

⁹⁶ White, *The Warfare of Science with Theology*, Vol. I, p. 352.

⁹⁷ Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 33.

⁹⁸ White, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 363.

the mouth, and fastened to the wall in such a way as to prevent the victim from lying down, was frequently used. The accused person was sometimes kept awake for five or six days and even for nine days in one case. The thumbscrew, breaking leg bones, tearing off the skin from the body and other horrible tortures were resorted to. Sometimes the victims were strangled before burning; often they were burned alive. The number of executions for witchcraft was staggeringly large. In Germany seven thousand victims were burned, six hundred of them by the Bishop of Bamberg. In France severe decrees were passed by the Parliaments of Paris, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Rheims, Rouen, Dijon, and Rennes. At Toulouse four hundred persons were executed on a single occasion. Judge Remy of Nancy boasted that he had slain eight hundred witches in sixteen years. Remigius, criminal judge in Lorraine, recorded on the title page of a manual against witchcraft the fact that within fifteen years he had condemned nine hundred persons to death for this crime.⁹⁹ An "almost infinite" number of executions occurred in Paris. In Italy there were a thousand victims in one year in the province of Como alone. Under the reign of a bishop in Geneva five hundred alleged witches were killed within three months. In Spain the notorious Torquemada was as energetic against witches as in the stamping out of heresy.

Benedict Carpzov, an eminent Lutheran theologian who boasted that he had read the Bible fifty-three times, was especially active in detecting and punishing

⁹⁹ White, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 358.

witches. An Anglican minister named Lowes, who was nearly eighty years old and who for fifty years had been an irreproachable minister of his church, fell under suspicion, was horribly tortured and then hanged as an agent of the devil. Among the twenty-seven persons executed for witchcraft in Massachusetts was an old man of eighty who was pressed to death. Cotton Mather, the leader of the attack upon witches in New England, was an extraordinarily gifted man. One of his biographers informs us that he had "on the whole a noble character. He believed strongly in the power of prayer; his spiritual nature was high strung and delicate. He was remarkable for his godliness, his enthusiasm for knowledge and his prodigious memory. He published more than four hundred works." His books, *Memorable Providences Relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions*, and *Wonders of the Invisible World*, were recommended by the governor of the province, the president of Harvard College, and eminent clergymen in Europe as well as in New England.

(6) *Conflict with Science*

It is difficult to believe that Jesus would have forcibly imposed his opinions on other people or that he would have suppressed ideas which differed from his own beliefs. His method was to permit the wheat and tares to grow together until the harvest. He taught that the goal of freedom is to be attained by the pursuit of truth. And yet the history of Christianity since it acquired power is one long story of suppression and persecution. Most of the advances in

science down to the end of the Nineteenth Century were made in spite of the opposition of powerful sections of the Christian church. In two large volumes on *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, Dr. Andrew D. White has cited a mass of evidence which shows that all too frequently Christian theologians have prevented the free pursuit of knowledge and have bitterly persecuted those who strayed from the orthodox fold.

For many centuries the church not only sought to control the theological beliefs of its members, it also attempted to dominate their thinking on all subjects, including the whole realm of science. Utterances of church councils and ecclesiastical dignitaries were supposed to be infallible authority concerning questions of geology, geography, astronomy, physics, chemistry, medicine, anthropology, ethnology, philology, political economy, history, and ethics. Failure to conform to orthodox ideas was heavily penalized, often with torture and sometimes with death.

Throughout most of Christian history it was considered a serious offense to doubt that the earth was created out of nothing directly by the hand of God in six days. Peter Martyr said: "Were this article taken away there would be no original sin, the promise of Christ would become void, and all the force of our religion would be destroyed."¹⁰⁰ Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, and Newton were all bitterly opposed by theologians. It was said that Newton "substituted gravitation for Providence." In 1560 an Academy for the Study of Nature was

¹⁰⁰Quoted by White, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 8.

founded at Naples, but it was quickly suppressed by ecclesiastical leaders. In later years the famous English preacher, Dr. South, denounced the Royal Society as irreligious. As late as the middle of the Eighteenth Century the faculty of the Sorbonne compelled Buffon to make a most humiliating recantation of certain simple geological truths, including these words: "I abandon everything in my book respecting the formation of the earth, and generally all which may be contrary to the narrative of Moses."¹⁰¹ The publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* created a storm throughout Christendom which has not yet entirely subsided. "If the Darwinian theory is true," cried one theologian, "Genesis is a lie, the whole framework of the book of life falls to pieces, and the revelation of God to man, as we Christians know it, is a delusion and a snare." Cardinal Manning described the new theory as "a brutal philosophy, to wit, there is no God, and the ape is our Adam." A Catholic authority denounced Darwin's ideas in the scathing words: "Their father is pride, their mother impurity, their offspring revolutions. They come from hell and return thither, taking with them the gross creatures who blush not to proclaim and accept them." Even Pope Pius IX launched an attack upon Darwin.¹⁰²

For nearly a thousand years it was regarded as heresy to maintain the doctrine of the antipodes. St. Augustine strenuously opposed the idea that men

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁰² Not all Catholics are opposed to the theory of evolution. See Osborne, *From the Greeks to Darwin*.

could exist on the opposite side of the earth. He steadily maintained that such an idea "gives the lie direct to King David and to St. Paul, and therefore to the Holy Ghost."¹⁰³ So overwhelming was the authority of the great Bishop of Hippo that the idea that the antipodes are inhabited made little headway. When Bishop Virgil, in the Eighth Century, asserted his belief in this doctrine he was promptly attacked by Pope Zachary and threatened with the loss of his bishopric. Several centuries later men were burned alive for upholding this heretical theory. Not only was Cecco d'Ascoli burned alive at Florence for holding this dangerous idea, along with other proscribed views, he was represented by Orcagna in a fresco on the walls of the Campo Santo at Pisa as being consumed by the flames of hell.¹⁰⁴

All branches of the Christian church—Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans, Calvinists—united in opposing the Copernican theory. Luther exclaimed: "This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth." Even the mild Melanchthon was stirred into exclaiming: "Now, it is a want of honesty and decency to assert such notions publicly, and the example is pernicious. It is the part of a good mind to accept the truth as revealed by God and to acquiesce in it." Calvin asked: "Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?" John Wesley declared that the new theory "tends

¹⁰³ White, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

toward infidelity." For refusing to abandon this and other heresies Giordano Bruno was hounded from country to country, imprisoned for six years in the dungeons of the Inquisition, and then burned alive.

When the crude telescope of Galileo revealed the moons of Jupiter and the mountains and valleys of the moon, all the power of entrenched authority was hurled against the new theory. Father Caccini insisted that "geometry is of the devil," and that "mathematicians should be banished as the authors of all heresies." Cardinal Bellarmin maintained that "his pretended discovery vitiated the whole Christian plan of salvation." Father Lecazre declared "it casts suspicion on the doctrine of the incarnation." Father Melchior Inchofer, of the Jesuits, used strong language in attacking Galileo: "The opinion of the earth's motion is of all heresies the most abominable, the most pernicious, the most scandalous; the immovability of the earth is thrice sacred; arguments against the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and the incarnation, should be tolerated sooner than an argument to prove that the earth moves." Pope Paul V decreed that "the doctrine of the double motion of the earth about its axis and about the sun is false, and entirely contrary to Holy Scripture."¹⁰⁵ There are few more pitiful or tragic figures in history than the aged scientist on his knees making the recantation which had been forced from him: "I, Galileo, being in my seventieth year, being a prisoner and on my knees, and before your Eminences

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 138

having before my eyes the Holy Book, which I touch with my hands, abjure, curse, and detest the error and the heresy of the movement of the earth." The works of Copernicus and Galileo were included in the *Index* of prohibited books as late as 1819.

For ten long centuries the church vigorously opposed surgery and put obstructions in the pathway of medical science.¹⁰⁶ Dissection was prohibited for the twofold reason that mutilation of the body might prevent the resurrection of the dead and that "the church abhors the shedding of blood." Many councils and decrees forbade surgery to monks. The Fourth Lateran Council prohibited surgical operations by priests and deacons. In 1243 the Dominican order forbade the bringing of medical treatises into their monasteries.

For many centuries the church substituted magic for medicine. Some of the remedies used now seem utterly incredible. The liver of toads, the blood of frogs and rats and the fibres of the hangman's rope were supposed to be especially efficacious. As a precaution against "nocturnal goblin visitors" a horrible concoction was recommended: "Put these worts into a vessel, set them under the altar, sing over them nine masses, boil them in butter and sheep's grease, add much holy salt, strain through a cloth, throw the worts into running water. If any ill tempting occur to a man, or an elf or goblin night visitor come, smear his body with this salve, and put it on his eyes, and cense him with incense, and sign him frequently with

¹⁰⁶On the other hand must be placed the story of the ecclesiastical hospitals and medical schools.

the sign of the cross.”¹⁰⁷ As late as 1784 certain officials in Bavaria urged prayers at the shrine of St. Hubert as a cure for the bite of a mad dog.

Inoculation against smallpox and other diseases was strongly opposed by ecclesiastical leaders. An English theologian, the Rev. Edward Massey, published a sermon in 1772 entitled, “The Dangerous and Sinful Practice of Inoculation.” The new practice was denounced by many ministers as “flying in the face of Providence,” or “endeavouring to baffle a Divine judgment,” or “an encroachment on the prerogatives of Jehovah, whose right it is to wound and smite.” Jenner’s discovery of vaccination was met with a storm of clerical abuse. Certain clergymen of Boston condemned vaccination as “bidding defiance to Heaven itself, even to the will of God.”¹⁰⁸ As late as 1885 Abbé Filiatrault, priest of St. James Church in Montreal, during a severe epidemic in that city, declared in a sermon: “If we are afflicted with smallpox, it is because we had a carnival last winter . . . it is to punish our pride that God has sent us smallpox.” Certain Catholic officials exhorted the faithful to take up arms rather than submit to vaccination.¹⁰⁹ The use of anæsthetics in obstetrical cases was denounced by Scotch clergymen as an effort “to avoid one part of the primeval curse on women.”

The record is clear and convincing: as persecutors Christians have had no superiors. Theological op-

¹⁰⁷ White, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 39.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 58.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 60.

ponents, heretics, Jews, infidels, witches, and men of science have been hounded to death with relentless zeal. There is an appalling amount of evidence to substantiate the opinion of Buckle that as compared with religious persecution "all other crimes are of small account," and that even secular wars have proved to be less calamitous to mankind than the destruction wrought by religious fanatics.

3. PERSONAL HABITS AND BELIEFS OF CHRISTIANS

(1) *Asceticism*

Asceticism has been widely practised in all ages.¹¹⁰ It was represented in the Jewish world by the Essenes. Jesus was probably familiar with this sect but refused to identify himself with it. At an early date, however, asceticism made its way into Christianity. *It has many marvellous achievements to its credit and has produced some of the noblest characters in all history.*¹¹¹ Professor Foakes-Jackson says that "without monasticism there would probably have been no chance of Christianity surviving the Dark Ages with sufficient vitality to create a new civilization." Since the purpose of this chapter, however, is not to draw up a balance sheet of the good and evil results of Christianity, but to emphasize certain marked contrasts between it and Jesus, I shall not attempt a comprehensive evaluation of asceticism.

¹¹⁰ See O. Hardman, *The Ideals of Asceticism*; and Joseph Ward Swain, *The Hellenic Origins of Christian Asceticism*.

¹¹¹ For sympathetic yet critical interpretations see A. Harnack, *Monasticism: Its Ideals and History*; Ian C. Hannah, *Christian Monasticism*; Henry Osborn Taylor, *The Mediæval Mind*, Vol. 1, chaps. 26-32.

There are three stages in the history of monasticism: the hermit life or anchoritism; cloister life; monastic orders. The first of these produced the most meagre social results and exhibited the worst excesses. In revolting against the sins of the world and the secularization of the church, thousands of Christians from the Fourth Century onward swarmed to the deserts and there subjected themselves to the most rigorous privations. Absolute poverty, absolute celibacy, severe bodily penances, and silent communion with God were the chief characteristics of the anchorites. St. Jerome in a famous letter pleaded with the wavering Heliodorous in these words: "A Monk cannot be perfect in his own land; not to wish to be perfect is a sin; leave all, and come to the desert. The desert loves the naked. O desert, blooming with the flowers of Christ! O solitude, whence are brought the stones of the city of the Great King! O wilderness rejoicing close to God! . . . Does the infinite vastness of the desert fright you? In the mind walk abroad in Paradise. Does your skin roughen without baths? Who is once washed in Christ needs not to wash again."¹¹²

Paul the Simple said three hundred prayers daily, counting them with pebbles, and was greatly distressed when he heard of a virgin who prayed seven hundred times a day.¹¹³ Dominicus, called Loricatus "the whipped," was accustomed to do penance during Lent by scourging his naked body as he chanted the Psalter, striking himself fifty thousand times

¹¹²Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 351.

¹¹³Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3, p. 165.

daily for six consecutive days.¹¹⁴ Akepsimas of Cyrus spent sixty years in the same cell, without seeing or speaking to anyone, and "looked so wild and shaggy, that he was once actually taken for a wolf by a shepherd, who assailed him with stones, till he discovered his error, and then worshipped the hermit as a saint."¹¹⁵ Romuald lived in a cell at Sytrio in unbroken silence for seven years, eating only vile food.¹¹⁶ St. John of Colombino drank water from a brook in which a leper had washed.¹¹⁷ A famous anchoret who lived in the caves of Mount Sinai, entirely without clothing, refused to see visitors on the ground that they interfered with the visits of the angels.¹¹⁸

St. Besarion spent forty days and nights in the midst of thorn bushes and is said never to have lain down when he slept. Hilarion of Syria lived for forty-eight years on a dreary sand beach near Gaza. "Macarius punished himself for killing a gnat in a moment of irritation by retiring to the Scetic marshes, and there spending six months in a state of nudity among the insects, till on his return he was only recognized by his voice, his skin being like an elephant's hide."¹¹⁹ Cleanliness was abhorred by most ascetics, and usually they became a hideous mass of clotted filth. St. Abraham lived for fifty years without washing his face or hands. A famous virgin, Silvia, refused

¹¹⁴Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 398.

¹¹⁵Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

¹¹⁶Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 395.

¹¹⁷S. Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, Vol. 8, p. 702.

¹¹⁸Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

¹¹⁹W. F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, p. 157.

to wash any part of her body except her fingers, while St. Euphragia and her sister nuns shuddered at the thought of a bath. St. Mary of Egypt, once a beautiful woman, expiated her sins by roaming the desert for forty-seven years as a black naked creature covered with filth.¹²⁰

The most famous of all the hermits was Simeon Stylites. He was known to fast for forty days during Lent annually for twenty-six years, and was accustomed to lace his body so tightly that the cord cut through to the bones. The last thirty-six years of his life were spent upon a sixty-foot pillar, the top of which was three feet in diameter. Through night and day, through scorching sun and howling storm, Simeon continued his meditations. Vast numbers of men—women were not permitted to approach him—came from all parts of Christendom to worship at his feet. Kings and emperors sought his blessing. He died of a loathsome ulcer at the age of sixty-nine. His biographer tells us that he was commissioned to stand by his side to pick up the worms that fell from his body, and to replace them in the sores, the saint saying to the worms, 'Eat what God has given you.'¹²¹ Canonized by the church, he has been revered as one of the holiest of saints.

The significance of this aspect of asceticism has been described in vivid language by Lecky: "There is, perhaps, no phase in the moral history of mankind of a deeper or more painful interest than this ascetic epidemic. A hideous, sordid, and emaciated maniac,

¹²⁰ W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol. 2, pp. 117, 118.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 119.

without knowledge, without patriotism, without natural affection, passing his life in a long routine of useless and atrocious self-torture, and quailing before the ghastly phantoms of his delirious brain, had become the ideal of the nations which had known the writings of Plato and Cicero and the lives of Socrates and Cato."¹²²

One of the most important phases of asceticism was its exaltation of celibacy and its depreciation of marriage and sexual relations.¹²³ The fact that Jesus was unmarried and that Paul sanctioned marriage as a concession to the flesh but regarded it as an inferior state made it easy for ascetics to conclude that true Christians should abjure marriage or at least refrain from conjugal relations, although in so doing they were compelled to ignore the positive teaching of Jesus about the sanctity of marriage and the emphatic statement of Paul that marriage is permissible. Gradually the church adopted an attitude on this question which departed widely from, if it did not absolutely contradict, the New Testament position. The primitive Christians held marriage in the highest possible esteem and gave an unrivalled exhibition of family loyalty.

Not until the end of the Fourth Century was there any general legislation against the continuation of marriage relations even by the higher clergy. The effort at the Council of Nicæa to make celibacy obligatory was defeated. By the beginning of the

¹²² W. E. H. Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 114.

¹²³ See H. C. Lea's monumental work,³ *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy* (Second Edition, 1884); and E. E. Sperry, *An Outline of the History of Clerical Celibacy in Western Europe to the Council of Trent*.

Fourth Century the marriage of higher ecclesiastics *after* ordination was prohibited. In 385 Pope Siricius issued a decretal commanding all higher clergy to cease conjugal relations. In the centuries which followed bishop after bishop and council after council exhorted and commanded priests and monks to refrain from marriage and all sexual relations, until the Council of Trent in 1563 "completed the theory of sacerdotal celibacy by erecting it into a doctrine." Those who asserted that a person in holy orders was capable of contracting a valid marriage, and those who denied that celibacy was superior to marriage were anathematized as heretics and the whole weight of the church thrown against them. This remains the law of the Roman Catholic church at the present time. The Greek church, on the other hand, has always permitted the parochial clergy to marry before ordination, but not afterward. Bishops and patriarchs are denied the right to marry, that is, they are always chosen from the monks.

Many of the early ecclesiastics held very debased ideas concerning sex and marriage. This is due partly to revulsion from the gross sensuality of the day and partly to the absorption from Greek philosophies and Oriental religions of the conception that matter is essentially evil and that "marriage and generation are from Satan." Tatian pronounced marriage to be corruption and fornication. The early Fathers regarded woman as "the door to hell, as the mother of all human ills. She should be ashamed at the very thought that she is a woman. She should live in continual penance, on account of the curses she had

brought upon the world. . . . She should be especially ashamed of her beauty, for it is the most potent instrument of the dæmon. . . . Women were even forbidden by a provincial council, in the Sixth Century, on account of their impurity, to receive the Eucharist into their naked hands."¹²⁴

St. Odo of Cluny gives a description of women which is too indecent to be quoted, after which the whole question is disposed of by asking: "Wherefore do we desire to embrace this bag of filth itself?"¹²⁵ A Dominican monk commends the action of a beautiful woman who prayed that she might be made a leper in order to avoid the fatal temptations of beauty. One of the greatest of the Benedictine scholars, Haef-ten, writes: "So great are the seductions of the inferior sex, and so great is the peril which these cause to the superior sex, that both Holy Scripture and the Fathers seem to forbid all communication between the opposite sexes."¹²⁶ Under some of the monastic codes the penalty for talking privately with a woman was from one hundred to two hundred stripes.¹²⁷ St. John of Lycopolis did not so much as see a woman for nearly a half century. An Egyptian monk, Pior, allowed his sister to see him but kept his eyes closed throughout the visit.¹²⁸ St. Carileff obstinately refused to break his rule even at the request of Queen Ultrogatha, who pleaded to be allowed to look upon his face. When Mutius, accompanied by his eight-

¹²⁴ Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 357, 358.

¹²⁵ G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. 1, p. 528.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 398.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 399.

¹²⁸ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 4, p. 15.

year-old son, was received into a monastery, he was reminded that "he had already forgotten that he was rich; he must next be taught to forget that he was a father."¹²⁹

(2) *Immorality of the Clergy*

Celibacy would have had disastrous results even if it had been strictly observed. Much more serious, however, were the never-ending revolts against its rigid code. That the effort to enforce celibacy upon the clergy led to gross immorality is not open to question. The 682 pages of Lea's monumental volume, *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, constitute one of the most disgraceful records in all literature. Since Dr. Lea's works are frequently regarded as unreliable by Catholic historians, it may be well to quote the opinion of Professor G. G. Coulton of Cambridge, himself an authority on the Middle Ages: "No European medievalist is likely to forget the debt that we all owe to Dr. H. C. Lea's enormous industry and general accuracy; his books are indispensable to all serious students of medieval society."¹³⁰ In a hundred other reliable histories the tragic story is told. Certain details may be doubted but in its main outlines the record of ecclesiastical immorality is unimpeachable. "Unfortunately," says Lea, "there can be no denial of the fact that notorious and undisguised illicit unions, or still more debasing secret licentiousness, was a universal and pervading vice of the church throughout Christendom.

¹²⁹ Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 133.

¹³⁰ *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. 1, p. 521.

Its traces amid all the ecclesiastical legislation of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth centuries are too broad and deep to be called into question."¹³¹

An abundance of proof is found in the decrees of various councils extending over a thousand years. "The repetition of almost identical enactments," says Lea, "year after year, with corresponding infinitesimal results, grows wearisome and monotonous."¹³² The Council of Toledo in 655 condemned the children of married ecclesiastics to slavery.¹³³ The Synod of Pavia in 1108 took similar action.¹³⁴ Under Leo IX a council at Rome "decreed that the wives of the clergy should be attached as slaves to the Lateran Palace, and all the bishops of the church were urged to inflict the same punishment upon the wives of the priests."¹³⁵ The Hungarian council of Ofen (Budapest) in 1279 decreed that the children of the clergy should become the slaves of the church.¹³⁶ The Council of Rouen commanded that the concubines of priests should have their heads shaved in the presence of the congregation on Sunday or some other solemn occasion.¹³⁷

The keeping of concubines by priests and bishops in many countries and various centuries was notorious. The abbot of S. Pelayo de Antealtaria in Spain was upbraided by his archbishop for keeping no less

¹³¹ Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

¹³² *Op cit.*, p. 280.

¹³³ Sperry, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹³⁶ Sperry, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

than seventy concubines.¹³⁸ Even the highest ecclesiastics were sometimes guilty. In speaking of conditions in the Tenth and Eleventh centuries, Schaff says: "Pope followed pope in rapid succession, and most of them ended their career in deposition, prison, and murder. . . . Three bold and energetic women of the highest rank and lowest character, Theodora the elder (wife or widow of a Roman senator) and her two daughters, Marozia and Theodora, filled the chair of St. Peter with their paramours and bastards. . . . They turned the church of St. Peter into a den of robbers, and the residence of his successors into a harem."¹³⁹ Theodora the elder was mistress of Pope John X, while Marozia was mistress of Pope Sergius III. John XII, grandson of Marozia, universally regarded as one of the most degraded popes, was deposed by a Roman synod after having been charged with numerous crimes. Among the charges against him were the following: "that he had committed homicide and adultery, had violated virgins and widows high and low, lived with his father's mistress, and converted the pontifical palace into a brothel."¹⁴⁰ It is said that he was killed in an act of adultery by the enraged husband of his mistress. In 1415 the Council of Constance deposed Pope John XXIII on charges of adultery, defilement, incest, and homicide. As chamberlain of Boniface IX he had openly kept his brother's wife as a concubine; as a cardinal he was reported to have seduced two hundred women in Bo-

¹³⁸ Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

¹³⁹ Schaff, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, pp. 283, 284.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

logna. After he was deposed he was made Dean of the Sacred College.¹⁴¹ Pope Alexander VI was notoriously sensual. Two years before his death he staged a wild party of fifty nude courtesans in the Vatican.¹⁴²

The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle declared that many convents "were rather brothels, than houses of God."¹⁴³ The famous Abélard "depicts the nuns of the period, in general terms, as abandoned to the most hideous licentiousness—those who were good-looking prostituting themselves for hire, those who were not so fortunate hiring men to gratify their passions, while the older ones, who had passed the age of lust, acted as procuresses. Innocent III may therefore be absolved from the charge of exaggeration when, in ordering the reform of the nuns of St. Agatha, he alludes to their convent as a brothel which infected with its evil reputation the whole country around it."¹⁴⁴

In the little town of Hof in the Vogtland three priests were found on Ash Wednesday fiercely fighting over a courtesan in a house of prostitution.¹⁴⁵ The city of Lausanne once complained because the clergy maintained their own mistresses in competition with the public brothel of the town.¹⁴⁶ Alexander IV issued a bull in 1259 in which he declared that the people were being debauched not reformed by their

¹⁴¹ Lea, *op. cit.*, pp. 343, 344.

¹⁴² Schaff, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, part 2, p. 461.

¹⁴³ Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 264, 265.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 428.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 429.

pastors.¹⁴⁷ St. Boniface was so horrified by the immorality of the clergy in Spain that he wrote to Gregory II and asked if he should continue to eat with them or speak to them.¹⁴⁸ Cardinal John of Crema, who was sent to England for the purpose of taking action against unmarried ecclesiastics, was himself caught in the company of a courtesan.¹⁴⁹ The abbot-elect of St. Augustine's of Canterbury was discovered to have seventeen illegitimate children in one village.¹⁵⁰ Henry, Bishop of Liège, was deposed by Gregory X after having scandalized Christendom for thirty years. In his accusation the Pope wrote: "You have taken a Benedictine abbess for your public concubine, and at a feast you boasted publicly of having had in twenty-two months no less than fourteen children."¹⁵¹

In the Kingdom of Naples, where state and church shared in the proceeds of the taxes laid upon the concubines of the clergy, Alfonso I complained bitterly that this tax had not been paid for three years.¹⁵² Nicholas de Clemanges, Secretary to Benedict III, declared that "in most of the dioceses the parish priests openly kept concubines, which they were permitted to do on payment of a tax to their bishops. Nunneries were brothels, and to take the veil was simply another mode of becoming a public prostitute."¹⁵³

¹⁴⁷ Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

¹⁴⁸ Sperry, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

¹⁴⁹ Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

¹⁵¹ Coulton, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 300.

¹⁵² Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 399.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 388, 389.

Rigaud, Archbishop of Rouen from 1248 to 1275, was a very methodical man and kept a careful record of his visits to various churches and monasteries. This *Register* constitutes one of the most damning indictments of the clergy which has been preserved. In it we read of a prior who was such a vile drunkard that he lies all night in the fields; a priest who keeps two women by whom he has had many children; a priest who admitted that he led the dance at the wedding of a prostitute; a nun who is pregnant as the result of a visit of a chaplain; a prioress who is drunk almost every night."¹⁵⁴

The citation of evidence of immorality on the part of the clergy could be continued almost indefinitely.¹⁵⁵ In no other respect have the official representatives of Christianity departed further from the religion and ethics of Jesus than in this realm of the relations between men and women.

The Puritans of New England were very religious and many of them were heavy drinkers. The eminent church historian Leonard Woolsey Bacon says: "The words of Isaiah concerning the drunkards of Ephraim seem not too strong to apply to the conditions of American Society that 'all tables were full of vomit and filthiness.' In the prevalence of intemperate drinking habits the clergy had not escaped the general infection."¹⁵⁶

The worst period of drunkenness was from about 1730 to 1830. "Everybody drank more or less, from

¹⁵⁴ Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 492-496.

¹⁵⁵ For an appalling mass of citation from Roman Catholic authorities on this question, see Coulton, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 504-654.

¹⁵⁶ *A History of American Christianity*, p. 286.

the minister and his deacon, downwards." The Reverend Leonard Woods said: "I remember when I could reckon up among my acquaintances forty ministers and none of them at a great distance, who were either drunkards, or so far addicted to drinking, that their reputation and usefulness were greatly impaired, if not utterly ruined. I could mention an ordination which took place about twenty years ago (1816) at which I myself was ashamed and grieved to see two aged ministers literally drunk, and a third indecently excited."¹⁵⁷ A correspondent of a Boston newspaper wrote: "A great many deacons in New England die drunkards. I have a long list of one hundred and twenty-three intemperate deacons in Massachusetts, forty-three of whom became sots."¹⁵⁸

We are told by Reverend I. N. Tarbox that "the drinking habits of all classes, ministers included, hung like a dead-weight upon the Churches. Ordinations were scenes of festivity, in which copious drinking had a large share. . . . Several councils were held in one of the towns of Massachusetts, where the people were trying to get rid of a minister who was often the worse for liquor, even in the pulpit, and once, at least, at the communion table; but some of the neighbouring ministers stood by him and the people had to endure him till his death."¹⁵⁹

During recent decades the churches have become increasingly active on behalf of the prohibition movement and are now its most effective supporters. But

¹⁵⁷ Quoted by Daniel Dorchester, *The Liquor Problem in all Ages*, p. 133.

¹⁵⁸ Dorchester, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

for many centuries and in numerous lands the ministers and officers of the Christian church were terribly involved in the liquor business.

(3) *Superstition and Magic*

Throughout its history Christianity has absorbed many superstitious ideas and magical practices from its semi-pagan surroundings and has promoted not a few of its own creation.¹⁶⁰ The New Testament record makes it clear that from the very beginning the new religion had to contend with wonder workers. The early apologists devoted much energy to refuting the claims of pagan magicians. And yet gradually and unconsciously many of the abhorred practices crept into the church in a new guise and under different names. From the Fourth Century onward belief in magic was rife throughout Christendom. Sometimes these beliefs were incorporated into the official utterances of ecclesiastics and councils; more often they represented the popular ideas of the masses. Frequently there was a marked contrast between the official attitude of the church and the prevailing practices of its members and often of its priests and bishops.

The name of Jesus was frequently used in casting out demons. It was both a defensive and an offensive weapon, serving alike for healing and cursing. The monogram, or initial letters, of Christ was often used as a charm. Christians were long accustomed to wear miniature Gospels or fragments of the Bible around their necks as amulets. The Psalms were regarded as especially potent against demons. Biblical

¹⁶⁰ S. Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, Vol. I, p. 342.

texts posted over the gates of Edessa were credited with saving the city from a Persian attack. Sacred superscriptions on door lintels were supposed to offer protection against lightning and hail. The *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, a collection of wonder stories about saints and devils, were widely circulated for several centuries.

The sign of the cross was almost universally used to ward off danger and disease. By this sign St. Martin was supposed to have deflected a tree that was falling upon him; St. Columban opened locks and bolts; Bernardinus of Siena held off a storm until he finished a sermon; Benedict shattered a cup of poison. To eat lettuce without making the sign of the cross was to run the risk of swallowing a demon. The cross was worn by Crusaders as a charm against the weapons of the infidels.

Whatever may have been the theology of the church, the rite of baptism was often regarded by ordinary Christians as being endowed with magical power. All past sins were automatically forgiven by baptism, while the unbaptized were doomed to hell. Even infants could not be saved without baptism. The rite was reported to have cured gout and paralysis; to insure victory in a duel and render impervious to sword and shot. Because Walter of Bierbecke was detained at mass, an angel was reported to have taken his place in the tournament.¹⁶¹

Millions of superstitious Christians have expected magical results from the emblems of the Holy Communion. In all ages it has been necessary to guard

¹⁶¹ S. Baring-Gould, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 342.

carefully the consecrated Host in order to prevent it from being used in magical practices. Peasants have sought consecrated bread to sprinkle over cabbages as a remedy against caterpillars. At various periods the church has been reluctant to give the Eucharist to a criminal on the gallows lest the Body of Christ should suffer hanging.¹⁶²

Holy oils, holy waters, as well as holy bread, have been widely used as antidotes against sickness and disaster. To various precious stones were attributed the possession of magical qualities. Marbod, Bishop of Rennes at the end of the Eleventh Century, declared that the sapphire, powdered and diluted with milk, heals ulcers, cleanses the eyes, stops headache, and even liberates those who are in prison. He also advocated the use of the magnet in detecting an unfaithful wife. If unchaste she will fall out of bed when the gem is applied to her head.¹⁶³ According to Vincent of Beauvais, one of the chief mediæval encyclopædists, the gem heliotrope makes one invincible in battle and invisible; the agate promotes fidelity; coral reduces corpulence; jasper prevents conception.¹⁶⁴ The monk Neckam, foster brother of Richard the Lion Hearted, attributed the spots on the moon to Adam's fall; and accounted for the birth of the basilisk by the hatching of a rooster's egg upon which a toad had been sitting.¹⁶⁵ William of Aubergne, Bishop of Paris in the Thirteenth Century, affirmed

¹⁶² Coulton, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 113, 115.

¹⁶³ Thorndike, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 779, 780.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 469, 470.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 353.

that consecrated bells could prevent storms and that demons could be expelled by salt and water which had been consecrated.¹⁶⁶ Roger Bacon believed that by an occult art flying dragons could be saddled and driven through the air to a desired destination.¹⁶⁷

The relics of Christ and the martyrs were thought to possess divine virtue. Pieces of wood from the Holy Cross were the most highly treasured of all relics. Healing and protective power were supposed to reside in every particle of a saint's body, the hair and teeth being especially efficacious. The relics of St. Gratus were given credit for extinguishing a forest fire in 1542. Valuable relics became a source of great income to a church. For centuries the craze for relics was so great that innumerable frauds were perpetrated. At present there are fifty-six fingers of St. Peter the Dominican in the churches of Europe, twenty-six heads of St. Julienne, thirty bodies of St. George, twelve heads of St. John the Baptist, seventy veils of the Virgin Mary, as well as many tears and footprints of Jesus.¹⁶⁸

It was thought that the graves of the saints would consecrate any object laid upon them. Images were also widely used as charms. It was said by St. Bridget that she once hung a wet coat over a sunbeam which supported the garment until late in the night.¹⁶⁹ There was a widely accepted tradition that when Thomas Aquinas, as a boy of twelve, was caught by

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 658.

¹⁶⁸ See *The Monthly Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 30-39.

¹⁶⁹ Baring-Gould, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 19.

his father in the act of distributing the family's supply of bread to the poor, the loaves turned into flowers.¹⁷⁰ This same story is told of several saints, especially of St. Elizabeth of the Wartburg. Ships were commonly adorned with images of the Madonna as protection against storms. The water used in washing images at high ceremonies was applied as an eye lotion or taken internally as a medicine. A procession with relics was used as a means of ending a drought. Magical incantations were often hurled at insects and reptiles. In 1497 the Bishop of Lausanne excommunicated the may bugs which were committing great depredation; the episcopal letter being solemnly read in the churches, accompanied by "three Pater-nosters and three Ave Marias."¹⁷¹ In 1532 a papal anathema was given credit for delivering mankind from the perils of a huge comet. It was widely believed that while St. Avia was in prison she was fed by the Blessed Virgin, who passed three loaves through the bars every day. St. James, Bishop of Nisibia, was said to have cursed some girls who washed their linen in a river with unveiled faces and exposed limbs, with the result that their hair became permanently white.¹⁷² At the second council of Nicæa in 787 a discourse was read which described how blood ran from an image of Christ when pierced with a spear by a Jew, the blood possessing miraculous healing powers.¹⁷³ Many of these superstitions

¹⁷⁰ Baring-Gould, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 121.

¹⁷¹ Viktor Rydberg, *The Magic of the Middle Ages*, p. 76.

¹⁷² Baring-Gould, *op. cit.*, Vol. 7, p. 351.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 13, p. 224.

have survived to the present day. Albert Rhys Williams has described a procession of Russian peasants led by a priest, who curses insects and reptiles of the field in these words:

“Worms and grasshoppers!
Mice and rats!
Ants, moles and reptiles!
Flies and horseflies and hornets!
And all flying things that wreak
Destruction . . .

I forbid you in the name of the Saviour come on earth to suffer for men. I forbid you in the name of the all-seeing cherubim and seraphim, who fly around the heavenly throne, I forbid you in the name of the angels and the millions of heavenly spirits, standing in the glory of God. I forbid you to touch any tree, fruitful or unfruitful, or leaf or plant or flower. I forbid you to bring any woe upon the fields of these people!”¹⁷⁴

Various kinds of magic have been used by Christians to detect evil doers. Consecrated bread was sometimes given to a suspected person; if he choked over it he was guilty. The man in whose eyes tears came as he passed a holy nail that had been driven in a wall was regarded as a thief. Suspects were sometimes stationed against a cross with arms outstretched, the one whose arms dropped first being pronounced guilty. Ordeals by fire and water were extensively used through Christendom as means of determining guilt. The evidence on this point is voluminous and terrifying. A vast quantity of data has

¹⁷⁴ *The Russian Land*, p. 97.

been collected by Dr. Henry C. Lea.¹⁷⁵ The ordeal of boiling oil is one of the oldest forms. Two or more suspects plunge their hands into a boiling cauldron, the one suffering least being declared innocent. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, was an ardent believer in the validity of this procedure. Walking barefooted on red-hot irons and carrying hot irons in one's hand were popular devices for determining guilt. The parentage of a disputed child was sometimes determined in this way. The ordeal by fire was also widely resorted to. St. Francis of Assisi offered to go through flames if the Sultan of the East would agree to become a Christian if he emerged safely.¹⁷⁶ Savonarola challenged his opponents to decide their controversy by entering the flames.

The prevalence of superstition and magic in the ranks of Christians has been accentuated by the fact that on several occasions great populations have been converted wholesale to the new religion. An outstanding illustration of this practice is found in the early history of Russia. In the Tenth Century Vladimir, Prince of Kiev, became a Christian in order that he might marry Anna, Princess of Constantinople. He then decreed that all his people should likewise embrace the new faith. An ancient manuscript describes how, after the chief idol had been dragged through the street and thrown into the river, "Vladimir ordered that all the inhabitants of Kiev should assemble next morning on the banks, and his officers proclaimed that if any disobeyed this order it would

¹⁷⁵ See his *Superstition and Force*.

¹⁷⁶ Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

be counted as treason against them.”¹⁷⁷ Whereupon vast multitudes were transformed from pagans into Christians by the waters of the Dnieper.

Pitifully meagre has been the progress made during the succeeding nine hundred years in helping the millions of Russian people to understand the real significance of their religion. Christianity to the average peasant, not only in Russia but in many other regions of Europe, means “to be baptized as an infant; to wear a cross around the neck, next to the body; to possess a Holy Icon; to pray to the Virgin and the Saints; to walk in religious processions; to go on pilgrimages; not to work on Saints’ Days; to fast on Wednesdays and Fridays and during Lent; to attend the sacraments; to stand in church during the services.” The kernel of true mysticism is usually covered over with a mass of superstition and magic. The melancholy truth is that the vast majority of Christians in every age and in all lands have never had more than a faint understanding of the real religion of Jesus.

(4) *Beliefs Concerning God*

Christians have often maintained horrible ideas as to the nature of God. The most savage concepts of God found in some portions of the Old Testament have been taken over by Christianity and made even more revolting. Jeremy Taylor, chaplain of King Charles, on one occasion referred to the time “when God had destroyed at once 23,000 for fornication, and an exterminating angel in one night killed 185,000

¹⁷⁷Quoted by C. R. Ballard, *Russia in Rule and Misrule*, p. 63.

Assyrians.”¹⁷⁸ About a century ago Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby and one of the keenest minds of his day, in addressing the boys of his school told them the story of how God sent two bears to devour the forty-two children who had mocked Elisha, and then concluded: “The point for you to observe is that God is angry with the faults of young persons as with those of grown-up men, and that he punished them as heavily.”¹⁷⁹

The ancient idea that God sends epidemics and pestilences as punishment for the sins of His people has been widely proclaimed in the Christian pulpit. To the Almighty has been attributed direct responsibility for the frequent plagues which have scourged Christendom. During a terrible epidemic of yellow fever in New York City in 1822, for example, the Rev. Paschal N. Strong, minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, said: “God then was pleased to send upon our city the pestilence—a pestilence highly contagious, voracious in its thirst for prey, rapid in its work of death, dreadfully malignant.” The preacher then went on to enumerate the sins which were responsible for God’s anger: failure to observe the Sabbath, the inordinate appetite for gain, general profligacy of morals, and the election of an infidel to public office. Ten years later, during an epidemic of malignant cholera, Dr. Gardiner Spring, pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church of New York City, said: “This fatal scourge is the hand of God. . . . It points us to the provoking cause of God’s displeasure,

¹⁷⁸ *Discourses*, p. 26.

¹⁷⁹ *Sermons* (edition of 1844).

and calls upon us to bow in penitential confession before his throne. . . . The judgment we deplore has aimed its vengeance at three prominent abominations—Sabbath-breaking, intemperance, and debauchery.” Throughout many centuries the Christian church failed to recognize the contradiction between the God of vengeance which it worshipped and the God of love proclaimed by Jesus.

The belief was practically universal throughout Christendom for many centuries, and still prevails widely, that God condemns unrepentant sinners to eternal torment in a literal lake of fire. This theme has been the central idea in literally millions of sermons since Jesus told the story of the prodigal son and taught that God is love and that it is not the will of the Father that one of these little ones should perish. Hell fire was at the heart of the message of great preachers like Jonathan Edwards. He was a foremost figure of his age and left a permanent impression upon the churches of North America. From the sermon entitled, “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,” the following typical words are chosen:

“The God that holds you over the pit of hell, much in the same way as one holds a spider, or some loathsome insect, over the fire, abhors you, and is dreadfully provoked; his wrath toward you burns like fire; he looks upon you as worthy of nothing else but to be cast into the fire; he is of purer eyes than to bear to have you in his sight; you are ten thousand times more abominable in his eyes than the most hateful venomous serpent is in ours. . . . O sinner, consider the fearful danger you are in! It is a great furnace of wrath, a wide and bottomless pit, full of the fire of

wrath, that you are held over in the hand of the God whose wrath is provoked and incensed as much against you as against many of the damned in hell. You hang by a slender thread, with the flames of divine wrath flashing about it and ready every moment to singe it, and burn it asunder. . . . God will not only hate you, but he will have you in the utmost contempt. . . . It is an everlasting wrath. . . . There will be no end to this exquisite horrible misery."

In a sermon entitled, "Wicked Men Useful in Their Destruction Only," Jonathan Edwards says: "When the blessed shall look upon the damned, and see their misery, how will heaven ring with the praises of God's justice toward the wicked, and his grace toward the saints. With what love and ecstasy will they sing that song in Rev. 5:9, 10." In his address on "The Future Punishment of the Wicked Unavoidable and Intolerable," he says: "God intends to magnify himself exceedingly in sinking you down in hell." Henry Ward Beecher once referred to God as "the incendiary of the universe, who by-and-by will burn you with unquenchable fire."

Orthodox theology not only consigns unrepentant sinners to hell fire, much emphasis is placed upon the duration of the torment of the damned. Charles G. Finney, one of the great evangelists of last century, described the length of eternity with the most vivid images. He often pointed out that if one drop of water were put into an empty ocean every thousand years, long after all the oceans were overflowing and the vast space between the earth and the distant stars were filled with water, eternity would still endure. He

also suggested that if a bird should remove only one grain of sand in ten centuries, æons after the earth and all the planets had been transported, eternity would continue. "It would not even begin to measure eternal damnation. How fearful, then, must be that woe which knows no limit save eternity."

Not only have the wicked and ungodly been condemned to eternal punishment by Christian theologians, the heathen who have never heard the name of Christ are likewise damned. Moreover, men of blameless character who have not confessed their faith in Christ are doomed to burn in the flames of hell. George Whitefield went so far as to say at a funeral sermon: "It is not his being a whore-monger or adulterer that will damn him, but his unbelief is the damning sin; for this he will be condemned; forever banished from the presence of the ever-blessed God." R. A. Torrey, the world-famous evangelist, said in a sermon which he repeated an endless number of times: "If you reject Jesus Christ, God will reject you, no matter what else you may do. . . . Our acceptance before God does not depend upon our own good words. . . . No man is saved by his own good character. . . . There is but one condition upon which any man is saved and that one condition is believing on Him who made the perfect atonement on the cross of Calvary. . . . Therefore, there is only one way to escape spending eternity in hell, that is by accepting Jesus Christ as your personal Saviour, surrendering to Him."

Most revolting of all, however, has been the attitude of orthodox theologians, Catholics and Prot-

estants alike, on the question of infant damnation. It seems utterly incredible that followers of the teacher who loved to gather little children around him and who said that no one could enter the Kingdom of God unless he became like a little child should solemnly consign all unbaptized infants to the flames of hell. And yet millions of mothers have been terrorized into believing that their beloved babies would be tortured endlessly unless they were sprinkled with water. Lecky tells of a theologian who said "he doubted not there were infants not a span long crawling about the floor of hell."¹⁸⁰ Among the many treatises on baptism written by the church Fathers few proved to be more formative and authoritative than *De Fide*, by St. Fulgentius, from which the following quotation is taken:

"Be assured and doubt not that not only men who have obtained the use of their reason, but also little children who have begun to live in their mother's womb and have there died, or who, having been just born, have passed away from the world without the sacrament of holy baptism, administered in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, must be punished by the eternal torture of undying fire; for although they have committed no sin by their own will, they have nevertheless drawn with them the condemnation of original sin, by their carnal conception and nativity."¹⁸¹

In 1844 the Oxford University Press republished the original work of William Wall on *A History of Infant Baptism*, which first appeared in 1705. The

¹⁸⁰ See *His Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, pp. 360 ff.

¹⁸¹ Quoted by Lecky, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 362, 363.

new edition consists of four massive volumes with a total of 2,253 pages and contains an unbelievably sordid story of the controversy which orthodoxy waged with heretics over a period of sixteen centuries, and which has not yet terminated, as to whether or not unbaptized infants could escape from the wrath of an angry God. The evidence is irrefutable that throughout most of its history organized Christianity has envisaged God as a horrible monster who casts unbaptized children into a fiery pit because of Adam's original sin.

4. PROPERTY AND POWER IN CHRISTIAN HISTORY

(1) *Ecclesiastical Corruption*

Graft on the part of ecclesiastics constitutes another marked contrast between historical Christianity and the religion of Jesus. The buying and selling of offices has flourished in numerous forms and in many lands. In proportion as the wealth and influence of the church increased the various offices were naturally more eagerly sought after. When the church began to exercise temporal powers as well as to perform spiritual duties, it was soon overrun with officials whose characters and objectives bore little resemblance to those of Jesus. Simony, the buying or selling of spiritual gifts or offices, has been so general that Bishop MacLean goes so far as to say that "no age and no country has been quite free from it."¹⁸² At the conclusion of his doctor's dissertation on this subject, N. A. Weber, a Catholic writer, says: "We have been

¹⁸² See his article on Simony, in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. II, pp. 525-528.

obliged to record many deplorable transgressions, many shameful transactions. . . . Simony ultimately developed to the extent of being one of the most disastrous abuses of the Christian Church."¹⁸³ From the Fourth Century onward church councils began to legislate against the exaction of fees for baptism, confirmation, administering the Eucharist, marriage ceremonies, unction with holy oil, burials, ordination, and similar functions. The frequency with which these admonitions are repeated is evidence of the wide prevalence of the practices thus condemned.

The buying and selling of ecclesiastical offices or promotion to higher office has been an exceedingly common practice. For several centuries heavy payments were required of bishops-elect in North Africa. The Council of Tours in 1163 forbade the exaction of fees for the admission of monks, while the Third Lateran Council in 1179 decreed against payments for enthroning bishops, installing abbots, and instituting presbyters. The Council of Constance in 1418 declared all offices vacant that were obtained by purchase. The very highest offices were openly sold under Innocent VIII, and the elections of Pope Alexander VI and of Julius II were accomplished by bribery.¹⁸⁴ In 1500 Alexander VI created twelve cardinals from whose appointment the notorious Cesare Borgia received \$270,000. Three years later nine more were appointed and Cesare received a similar amount.¹⁸⁵ Pope Pius IV made a cardinal of

¹⁸³ *A History of Simony in the Christian Church*, pp. 239, 241.

¹⁸⁴ MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 526.

¹⁸⁵ *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. 1, p. 672.

Ferdinand de Medicis when he was a boy of thirteen. Thomas Aquinas deals at length with the evils of simony, as does Chaucer in his *Canterbury Tales*. Guiot cries out that "the cardinals are stuffed with avarice and simony and evil living; without faith or religion, they sell God and His Mother, and betray us and their fathers. Rome sucks and devours us; Rome kills and destroys all."¹⁸⁶

Some of the most disgraceful excesses of the ecclesiastics are found in connection with the sale of indulgences.¹⁸⁷ An indulgence originally meant the remission of the works of satisfaction required by the sacrament of penance.¹⁸⁸ Catholic theologians have repeatedly denied that an indulgence confers forgiveness of guilt; only the remission of penalties after forgiveness. "In the 13th century," says David S. Schaff, "it came to be regarded as a remission of the penalty of sin itself, both here and in purgatory. At a later stage, it was regarded, at least in wide circles, as a release from the guilt of sin as well as from its penalty."¹⁸⁹

The first notable use of indulgences was by Urban II at the time of the First Crusade, although the practice was found as early as the Ninth Century. To all who would enlist in the war against the Saracens, the Pope offered commutation of all penances

¹⁸⁶Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 491.

¹⁸⁷The classic treatment of this subject from a Protestant point of view is H. C. Lea, *A History of the Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, especially volume 3.

¹⁸⁸See a Catholic doctor's dissertation by Francis Edward Hagedorn, *General Legislation on Indulgences*.

¹⁸⁹Schaff, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, part 2, p. 757.

and the assurance of eternal salvation if they died in the holy cause. Later this device was used in securing recruits in the struggle against heretics. The Third Lateran Council in 1179 ordered a crusade against the Cathari of Languedoc, promising salvation to those who fell and two years' remission of penance to those who survived. In 1208 Innocent III offered plenary or full indulgence to those who enlisted against the Albigenses. Pope Urban VI offered indulgence for a year's service against his rival Clement VIII. So effective did this method prove to be that it was used almost indiscriminately in the petty wars between rival ecclesiastics and secular princes. Gradually the practice of substituting payments of money for personal service in a crusade spread over Christendom. At the Lateran Council in 1216 Pope Innocent offered plenary indulgences to those who would contribute money for the rescue of the Holy Land. Cardinals and bishops, as well as popes, granted indulgences. In referring to the period from 1100 to 1500, Lea writes: "It would scarce be too much to say that, during the whole of these four centuries, there was probably not a year, save those of jubilees, when the cross was not preached in some part of Europe, or *quæstuarii* were not busy in collecting from the faithful sums ostensibly to be devoted to the war against the infidel or the so-called heretics."¹⁹⁰

Indulgences were also granted for aid in building or repairing churches and other religious edifices, and for the construction of bridges and roads. In 1300 Boni-

¹⁹⁰ Lea, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 154.

face VIII proclaimed a jubilee and offered the fullest pardon of sins to all who would visit for fifteen or thirty days during the year the basilica of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome. From all over Christendom such vast throngs poured into the city that men and women were trampled under foot. So generous were the offerings from the pilgrims that two clerks stood by the altar of St. Paul day and night raking in the coins. Subsequently the practice grew up of substituting money payments for the pilgrimage to Rome. Since 1450 jubilees have been held each quarter century.

Gradually the practice developed of granting indulgences to souls in purgatory. In 1476 Sixtus IV granted the church at Xaintes the right to issue indulgences for the deceased. Upon the payment of a fixed sum it was declared that a soul would immediately fly from purgatory to heaven.¹⁹¹ Step by step the sale of indulgences was extended. The fine-spun distinctions of the theologians had little meaning for the mass of the people. What they were chiefly concerned about was the remission of the penalties of their sins and the deliverance of their loved ones from purgatory. The evils of the system were greatly exaggerated by the practice of selling indulgences on credit—and then making collections by means fair and foul. The credulity of the people was so preyed upon by mercenary ecclesiastics that the selling of salvation became the scandal of Christendom and one of the primary causes of the Reformation.

Enormous incomes were received by some ecclesias-

¹⁹¹ *Lea, op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 347.

tics from the sale of benefices. Rodrigo Borgia, who was made a cardinal while still a youth by his uncle Calixtus III, received more than \$150,000 annually,¹⁹² in an age when the purchasing power of money was much greater than at the present time. Cardinal Piero Riario wasted \$135,000 each year in shameless excesses, running deeply into debt. Franceschetto Cibo, son of Innocent VIII, lost \$30,000 over the gambling table to Cardinal Riario in one evening, and half that much to Cardinal Balue on another occasion.¹⁹³ Paul II spent huge sums on art and church buildings, yet upon his death he left money and jewels of priceless worth; "we hear of pearls inventoried at 300,000 ducats (\$675,000), the gold and jewels of two tiaras appraised at 300,000 more, and other precious stones and ornaments at 1,000,000. All this was wasted by Sixtus IV on his worthless kindred and on the wars in which he was involved for their benefit."¹⁹⁴ Leo X received more than a million dollars annually from the sale of 2,000 offices.¹⁹⁵ The profligate John XXII wasted enormous sums, yet at his death he left a fortune variously estimated at from two to sixty million dollars. By common agreement he was the richest man in Christendom.¹⁹⁶

Many ecclesiastics also held high secular positions. The Archbishop of Rheims was a duke, as was the Bishop of Langres. The bishops of Beauvais and Noyon were counts. The Archbishops of Cologne

¹⁹² See *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. 1, p. 659.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 666.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 666.

¹⁹⁵ Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation*, p. 22.

¹⁹⁶ Schaff, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, part 2, p. 70.

and Mainz were chief princes of the land.¹⁹⁷ The second council of Milan in 1569 found it necessary to banish all indecent pictures from churches.¹⁹⁸ The devout St. Bernard was horrified by the practices everywhere prevalent. "To-day," he said, "foul rottenness crawls through the whole body of the Church. . . . Ministers of Christ, they serve Antichrist. . . . Hence that *éclat* of courtesan which you daily see, that theatrical garb, that regal state. Hence the splendid tables laden with food and goblets; hence the feastings and drunkenness . . . the jars of perfume, and the stuffed purses. 'Tis for such matters that they wish to be and are the over-seers of churches, deacons, archdeacons, bishops, and archbishops. For neither do these offices come by merit, but through that sort of business which walketh in darkness!"¹⁹⁹ On another occasion Bernard cried out: "O vanity of vanities, yet no more vain than insane! The church is resplendent in her walls, beggarly in her poor. She clothes her stones in gold, and leaves her sons naked."²⁰⁰

The outstanding illustration of ecclesiastical corruption in modern times is found in Russia. From the overthrow of the Patriarchate by Peter the Great in 1721 to the downfall of the Romanoffs in 1917, the Russian church was controlled absolutely by the Czars. All members of the Holy Synod were required to take the following oath: "I acknowledge him (the

¹⁹⁷Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 489.

¹⁹⁸Baring-Gould, *op. cit.*, Vol. 13, p. 123.

¹⁹⁹Taylor, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 490.

²⁰⁰Quoted by R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p. 30.

Czar) to be the supreme Judge in this spiritual assembly." The real ruler of the church during these two centuries was the procurator, the personal agent of the monarch. Although the procurators were laymen, often dissolute and sometimes atheistic, they dictated all policies of the church, including the appointment of the chief ecclesiastics. The priesthood, like the police, was simply an appendage of the government. Most of the parish priests were illiterate and superstitious; frequently they were greedy and immoral. As a rule they had no fixed income but depended upon fees and offerings. The degrading custom grew up of haggling over the fee required for officiating at funerals, weddings, baptisms, and other ecclesiastical functions.

When it is recalled that throughout this long period the Russian monarchy was guilty of almost every conceivable crime and barbarity, the shameful position of the Christian church is all too apparent. Seldom have religion and reaction been more indissolubly linked together. The Russian church almost uniformly supported the government in its acts of tyranny and cruelty, while all reform movements looking toward greater freedom and an increase of popular government met with vigorous opposition from the ecclesiastical hierarchy. For its subserviency the church was well paid. Through the centuries it accumulated vast riches and almost unlimited power. Its altars were bedecked with rare jewels and its coffers jingled with fine gold, but it failed tragically to reveal the religion of Jesus.²⁰¹

²⁰¹ See Charles T. Byford, *The Soul of Russia*.

(2) *Feudalism*

For nearly a thousand years feudalism prevailed over parts of Europe. Throughout this entire period the Christian churches were deeply entangled in the prevailing economic system.²⁰² Let us, therefore, examine the chief characteristics of feudalism and compare or contrast it with the religion of Jesus. At no time was feudalism absolutely uniform in the various regions of Europe. While many varieties existed in the respective countries and during different centuries, four usages were widely prevalent: monopoly of land ownership in the hands of the nobles and the higher clergy; the obligation of these owners to equip themselves and wage war at their own expense; the duty of vassals or serfs to render service to their masters; the frequent if not usual miscarriage of justice.²⁰³

Vast estates were common wherever feudalism existed. At times small holdings disappeared almost entirely and an absolute monopoly prevailed. In an age when the church dominated so large a share of all life it was inevitable that it should accumulate much property. There came a time when "there was not a bishopric, an abbey, a chapter of canons or a collegiate church that had not become a great landholder." As early as the Ninth Century the richest clergy possessed from 75,000 to 140,000 acres of land and had an annual income of \$85,000 to \$225,000, while the income of the poorest bishops and abbots

²⁰² For an invaluable discussion of the church and feudalism see J. W. Thompson, *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages*, pp. 603-698; see also his *Feudal Germany*.

²⁰³ See Charles Seignobos, *The Feudal Régime*.

ranged from \$5,000 to \$14,000.²⁰⁴ This was in the days before the church became really wealthy. During the next three centuries clerical wealth increased enormously. One abbot "had among his vassals 4 archdukes, 10 counts palatine and margraves, 27 counts and 28 barons and knights."²⁰⁵ Princes, nobles, wealthy merchants, Jews, and monks alone could afford to live in great stone houses and be waited upon by many servants. It has been estimated that in the Thirteenth Century the church owned one third of the land of Germany, one fifth of France, the greater part of Italy, one third of England, vast areas in Spain, Scandinavia, and other parts of Europe.²⁰⁶ The church was incomparably the greatest secular and economic power of the age. As late as the closing decades of the Eighteenth Century one fifth of the entire domain of France was owned by the church.

During this whole period the upper class was restricted almost entirely to two groups: warriors and the clergy. All noblemen were trained at arms and since waging war was an expensive business, members of the nobility required an independent income and to be relieved of the necessity of earning their own livelihood. Land monopoly made this possible. The customs of the time and especially the growth of chivalry lauded the profession of arms so highly that it embraced all who could afford it and who were physically fitted for martial life, the one conspicuous exception being the higher clergy. And, as we have

²⁰⁴Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 650.

²⁰⁵G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. 2, p. 35.

²⁰⁶Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Medieval Church*, p. 574.

already noted, bishops and abbots frequently led their followers in battle.

The serf differed from the slave in that he could not be sold. His obligations to his superior, however, were often so numerous and exacting as to make his condition one of actual slavery. He could not leave or establish himself elsewhere without his master's permission. The right of pursuit and capture was an unquestioned prerogative of the master. Among the recognized duties of serfs were the bearing of arms at the command of his master; the payment of taxes, either in money or goods; the filling of requisitions by the lord, including entertainment for the latter and his entourage when travelling; the obligation to perform physical labour for the master, such as ploughing, harvesting, and road making; the recognition of banalities, that is, certain obligations imposed by the master, including the requirement that the serfs patronize the master's mills and other monopolies. There were long periods when it was a rare occurrence for the owner to manage his estate personally. As a rule, supervision was delegated to an overseer, who managed the place, collected taxes, punished evil doers, and executed persons sentenced to death. Ordinarily the overseer received no salary or wages, earning his livelihood by retaining a portion of the taxes for himself. Under this arrangement nothing short of a miracle could prevent him from becoming a grafter and petty tyrant.

The helplessness of the vassals was further increased by the irresponsibility of the master. There was no state or outside agency to stand between the

exploiter and his victims. The lord's wishes constituted the only justice received by serfs. "In almost all the documents of the middle ages," says Seignobos, "justice means the right of levying fines or the product of those fines. . . . Feudal society was not acquainted with justice that was the same for all. Justice, like peace, was not a common right; in the middle ages it was a privilege. There was a different justice and special courts for each class."²⁰⁷ Tenants could not even gather together to discuss grievances without permission from the landlord. Illicit assemblage was a crime.

When it is recalled that for several centuries more than three fourths of the population of great areas of Europe were serfs, the incalculable amount of misery caused by this economic and social system will be more clearly realized.²⁰⁸ In France the institution survived until the end of the Eighteenth Century. It is estimated by Coulton that as late as 1789 there were still three hundred thousand serfs in France. In Russia serfdom was not abolished until the close of the Nineteenth Century. Wherever and whenever certain groups wield irresponsible power over other groups there will occur exploitation, injustice, and cruelty. The civilized world was horrified by the reports of inhumanity toward serfs that came out of Russia. Yet this same kind of barbarity prevailed throughout Europe in one form or another for several hundred years.

And all the while monasteries and churches were

²⁰⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 18, 59.

²⁰⁸ See W. S. Davis, *Life on a Mediæval Barony*, pp. 253-274.

terribly entangled in the system. The higher clergy, as we have seen, controlled vast landed estates and dominated the lives of countless vassals. "The Roman Church in the Middle Ages," says Professor J. W. Thompson, "was a governor, a landed proprietor, a rent collector, an imposer of taxes, a material producer, an employer of labour on an enormous scale, a merchantman, a tradesman, a banker and mortgage-broker, a custodian of morals, a maker of sumptuary laws, a schoolmaster, a compeller of conscience—all in one. The medieval Church was a feudalized Church; it was in and of the feudal world."²⁰⁹

While it is undoubtedly true that monks and abbots and bishops often proved to be benevolent and kindly masters, the records of the period are filled with protests against their greed and rapacity. There was little or no difference in the treatment of serfs on clerical and lay estates. Professor Thompson says that "serfs on church lands were not better off than those on lay lands. There is ground even to believe that as a whole their lot was worse."²¹⁰ After an exhaustive examination of the evidence, Professor G. G. Coulton of Cambridge has expressed the opinion that the serfs on a monastic estate were, "to put it roughly," five per cent. better off than the vassals of a secular estate. Even if we multiply this figure tenfold and say that there was a fifty per cent. improvement, the record is still shockingly disgraceful. Proof of this injustice is found in the fact that in the

²⁰⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 648, 676.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 680.

numerous peasant revolts "they nearly always struck with equal rage at the squire and at the monk." Professor Achille Luchaire expressed the opinion that "the clerics of the Middle Ages showed almost as much cruelty to the peasants and burghers as did the men of the sword."²¹¹

The church accepted feudalism and made only the feeblest and most sporadic efforts to overthrow it. Regulation and reform was its motto. The long-established custom of patching up the existing order was adhered to and radical changes were frowned upon. Indeed, the church was a primary factor in prolonging the life of feudalism. Numerous synodical decrees prohibited the alienation of church property, including slaves and serfs. "The serf might often buy his freedom," says Professor Coulton, "but it was seldom given to him. It was on Church estates that bondage lasted longest."²¹² Professor Thompson expressed the same opinion: "In the matter of serfdom itself the Church was conservative to the point of being reactionary. Anselm, the father of scholasticism . . . said: 'For if any man and his wife . . . commit in partnership a grievous and inexcusable fault, for which they are justly degraded and reduced to serfdom, who would assert that their children whom they beget after their condemnation should not be subject to the same servitude?' . . . In the matter of emancipation of serfs, the Church lagged behind secular Europe and even retarded emancipation."²¹³ Mel-

²¹¹Quoted by Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 680.

²¹²Coulton, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 8.

²¹³*Ibid.*, p. 679.

anchthon, one of the greatest Protestant reformers, wrote: "If serfdom exists, it should be left alone for the sake of peace. The Gospel does not require a change in the serf's condition, but it does require obedience to government."²¹⁴

The church of the Middle Ages was a paradox. Perhaps it has never been characterized more accurately than in these words: "Democratic, yet aristocratic; charitable, yet exploitive; generous, yet mercenary; humanitarian, yet cruel; indulgent, yet severely repressive of some things; progressive, yet reactionary; radical, yet conservative."²¹⁵ If one looks only at the favourable side, it is possible to write such a book as *The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries*, by Dr. James J. Walsh. But if the seamy side is also examined it is not possible to avoid the conclusion that many of the economic practices of the Christian church in the age of feudalism were a denial and repudiation of the basic principles of Jesus.

(3) *Divine Right of Kings*

Throughout many generations the doctrine of the divine right of kings held sway. "It was essentially a popular theory," says J. N. Figgis, "proclaimed in the pulpit, published in the market-place, witnessed on the battle-field."²¹⁶ It is almost impossible for persons who have been reared in a democratic community to appreciate the extent to which men's minds were dominated for many centuries by this

²¹⁴Quoted by J. S. Schapiro, *Social Reform and the Reformation*, p. 78.

²¹⁵Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 684.

²¹⁶*The Divine Right of Kings*, p. 3.

idea. The first two verses of the thirteenth chapter of Romans have been quoted an endless number of times as a justification of the perpetuation of infamous tyrannies: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they shall receive to themselves damnation." To question the divine right of a king to rule his subjects was long regarded as both heresy and treason. Until recently orthodox ecclesiastics have usually sided with reactionaries and opposed efforts toward political democracy.

The early Fathers of the church were almost unanimous in declaring that resistance to established authorities is sinful. Upon this foundation theologians of succeeding centuries erected an elaborate superstructure. The prevailing dogma was phrased by one of its ardent advocates in these words: "We will still believe and maintain that our Kings derive not their title from the people but from God; that to Him only they are accountable; that it belongs not to subjects, either to create or censure, but to honour and obey their sovereign, who comes to be so by fundamental hereditary right of succession, which no religion, no law, no fault or forfeiture can alter or diminish."²¹⁷

Catholics and Protestants alike have defended this doctrine with enthusiasm and ruthlessness. Jeremy Taylor, one of the greatest of Anglican theologians, wrote: "this also is as plain in itself, and without

²¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

any variety, dissent or interruption universally agreed upon, universally practiced and taught, that, *let the powers set over us be what they will, we must suffer it and never right ourselves.*"²¹⁸ Another English writer said: "Heaven is the place of good obedient subjects, and hell the prison and dungeon of rebels against God and their prince."²¹⁹

In the *Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion* we read: "Monarchy is of divine right, being a copy of the divine rule; rebels will be punished with eternal damnation; history abundantly proves that it is as foolish and futile as it is wicked; subjects are no fit judges of the goodness or badness of a prince; rebellion is not a single sin but 'the puddle and sink of all sins against God and man.'"²²⁰

On July 30, 1682, John Whitfeld preached a fifteen-thousand-word sermon before the Lord Mayor and aldermen of London on the subject, "The Dreadfulness of the Sin of Despising Dominion and Speaking Evil of Dignities," in which he said: "The Apostle makes it a main Master-piece of Christianity, when he joyns 'Fear God, and honour the King,' so indivisibly together. . . . He that is not a good Subject, cannot be a good Christian." On another occasion before the same distinguished company, Edmond Hickeringill said: "The King himself is accountable for his Errors to none but God, his Personal errors; but as King and in his Politick capacity,

²¹⁸ Quoted by Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. 2, p. 176.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

²²⁰ Quoted in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 12, p. 682.

it is impossible he should have any Errors, for a King of England can do no wrong.”²²¹

Early in the Eighteenth Century Luke Milbourne wrote: “If we enquire into the Characters of the Promoters and Defenders of this Notion, That the Original of all Power is in the People: we shall find that they are generally Men of no Religion, no Principles, no Honour, no Honesty. . . . In short, they are the Scum and Offscouring of the World; the perpetual Plagues of the Places they Live in; the irreconcilable Enemies of Piety and Peace. . . . If God be the only Ruler of Princes, then Princes cannot be accountable to any but Him.”²²²

In a sermon before the University of Oxford on December 13, 1776, Myles Cooper, president of King’s College (later Columbia University) in New York City, said: “When men’s principles are wrong, their practices will seldom be right. When they suppose those powers to be derived solely for the people, which are ‘ordained of God’ . . . when once they conceive the governed to be superior to the governors . . . they open a door for anarchy. . . . Such wild, visionary, enthusiastic notions, with regard to society, have always been counteracted and opposed by the example and instructions of this University; which may without vanity boast, that amid the greatest revolutions of human affairs, and fluctuations of opinions, it hath been steadier in its principles. . . . Let very man then be contented with his station, and faithfully discharge its attendant duties. Let

²²¹ Edmond Hickeringill, *Curse Ye Meroz*.

²²² Luke Milbourne, *The People Not the Original of Civil Power*, 1706.

every private view be abandoned, as soon as it is found to interfere with the interest and honour of the public."

An Edinburgh minister in 1798 consoled his people with these words: "But however much the operations of war are to be lamented, the events of it, like all other events, should be regarded as the work of God. . . . As it is absolutely a sin to refuse paying taxes, so it is very unbecoming in a Christian to murmur at the amount of them. His treasure is in heaven. Silver and gold are not his Gods. If taxes increase, God wills that he should be so much poorer, and good is the will of the Lord."²²³

King James I had a habit of telling his Parliament that "they held their privileges merely during his pleasure, and that they had no more business to inquire what he might lawfully do than what the Deity might lawfully do."²²⁴ As late as 1856 the Reverend Moses Margoliouth defended the autocrats who sat upon the Russian throne in these words: "When I speak of the Romanoff dynasty as a noble dynasty, I speak so advisedly. I believe it to be one to which very few reigning dynasties can present a parallel for true greatness and nobility. . . . It is our duty to look upon Alexander II as the Lord's anointed."²²⁵ In a volume the English edition of which was published in 1882 Bishop Martensen strongly indorsed the principle of a hereditary monarchy "because of its full manifestation of the fact that the king exists

²²³ Greville, Ewing, *The Duty of Christians to Civil Government*, pp. 2, 25.

²²⁴ Quoted in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 4, p. 832.

²²⁵ Moses Margoliouth, *The Lord's Anointed: A Coronation Sermon*.

not by the will of the people, but by the will of God, that the king and his authority are given us, that subjective arguing is in this matter of as little use as it would be to complain that we have not other parents than those whom God has given us."²²⁶ In his famous Königsberg speech of 1910 the German Kaiser said: "Considering myself as the instrument of the Lord, without heeding the views and opinions of the day, I go my way." On another occasion he said: "The king holds his power by the grace of God, to whom alone he is responsible."

(4) *Industrial Revolution*

The attitudes and practices of Christian employers during the early stages of the industrial revolution in England afford another series of illustrations of the misuse of property and power. Any drastic change in the methods of production and distribution is sure to be accompanied by suffering on the part of many dislodged workers. At the end of the Eighteenth Century in England, however, the industrial changes were so rapid and the prevailing economic philosophy so destructive of human values that masses of people were plunged into acute misery.

A series of mechanical inventions greatly increased output and gave a tremendous impetus to the factory system. Many skilled artisans found their trades destroyed almost overnight by mass production. Simultaneously, large numbers of rural peoples were driven into the towns and cities by the inclosure of public lands. The need of the factories for unskilled

²²⁶ H. Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, Vol. 2, p. 187.

workers led to the exploitation of women and children. This combination of events produced incalculable misery. The whole ghastly story has been gathered together in four volumes by J. L. and Barbara Hammond.²²⁷

In his famous Poor Law Bill the proposal was made by Pitt that children should be set to work at the age of five. Children of six and seven were employed on a widespread scale, and their hours were incredibly long. Twelve- to fifteen-hour schedules were common. At the Felling Pit boys worked for eighteen to twenty hours.²²⁸ The Second Factory Act of 1819 prohibited the employment of children under nine years of age in cotton mills and limited the hours of children from nine to sixteen years of age to twelve per day. Conditions in unprotected industries were much worse.²²⁹ As late as 1840 the boys in the Kidderminster carpet factory began work at three or four o'clock in the morning and laboured for sixteen to eighteen hours, while children of five were engaged in the unhealthy trade of pin making and were on duty from six in the morning until eight in the evening.²³⁰ Apprentices were customarily bound out until the age of twenty-one and received practically no wages above bare subsistence.

The exploitation of chimney sweeps was brutal beyond belief. Little children from five to eight years

²²⁷ *The Town Labourer, The Village Labourer, The Skilled Labourer, The Rise of Modern Industry.*

²²⁸ J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Town Labourer*, p. 28.

²²⁹ E. P. Cheyney, *An Introduction to the Social and Industrial History of England*, p. 235.

²³⁰ W. E. H. Lecky, *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 6, p. 225.

of age were trained to force their way through long, narrow passages to clear away the soot. Frequently they were half stifled by the smoke and sulphurous air; sometimes they fainted with exhaustion; often they got stuck in a chimney; some died before they could be rescued. Yet this horrible condition prevailed for many decades.

In the mines young children were often placed at the responsible task of opening and closing trapdoors. For twelve hours or longer daily they were compelled to sit in darkness and solitude. In 1840 an official commission reported on conditions in the mines:

“Children began their life in the coal mines at five, six, or seven years. Girls and women worked like boys and men; they were less than half clothed, and worked alongside of men who were stark naked. There were from twelve to fourteen working hours in the twenty-four, and these were often at night. . . . A common form of labour consisted of drawing on hands and knees over the inequalities of a passage-way not more than two feet or twenty-eight inches high a car or tub filled with three or four hundred weight of coal, attached by a chain and hooked to a leather band around the waist.”²³¹

The terrible misery of the masses was made more acute and widespread by the economic and political ideas which were then dominant. As a revolt against the rigid control of life by the government which had so long prevailed and as a result of the emphasis on liberty stimulated by the French Revolution, the

²³¹ Cheyney, *op. cit.*, pp. 243, 244.

theory of laissez faire was rapidly becoming supreme; the doctrine of enlightened self-interest was arising; competition was being extolled by economists and moralists; the inevitability and even the desirability of poverty were being proclaimed.

The rising school of economists was strongly opposed to government interference with industry. Adam Smith regarded such action as "a manifest encroachment upon the just liberty both of the workman and those who might be disposed to employ him."²³² While regulation of industry by the state was looked upon with extreme disfavour, the protection of property was regarded as a primary function of government. In his famous Speech on the Reform Bill, Macaulay referred to property as "that great institution for the sake of which chiefly all other institutions exist, that great institution to which we owe all knowledge, all commerce, all industry, all civilization, all that makes us different from the tattooed savages of the Pacific Ocean."

The theory of enlightened self-interest spread rapidly. It was assumed that the best way to advance the public welfare is to permit every individual to seek his own private gain, and since he is intelligent he will recognize the advisability of setting limits to his own greed. Archbishop Whately once said: "It is curious to observe how through the wise and beneficent arrangement of Providence, men thus do the greatest service to the public when they are thinking of nothing but their own gain." Edmund Burke was

²³² Cheyney, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

of the opinion that we should be filled with "thankfulness to the benign and wise Disposer of all things, who obliges men, whether they will or not, in pursuing their own selfish interests, to connect the general good with their own individual success. . . . But if the former is avaricious? Why, so much the better—the more he desires to increase his gains, the more interested is he in the good condition of those upon whose labour his gains must depend."²³³ A House of Commons committee in 1817 reported as follows: "By following the dictates of their own interests, landowners and farmers become, in the natural order of things, the best trustees and guardians for the public."²³⁴

In 1801 James Anderson wrote: "Private interest is the great source of public good, which, though operating unseen, never ceases one moment to act with unabating power, if it be not perverted by the futile regulations of some short-sighted politician."²³⁵ The clergyman Malthus, in his *Essay on Population* in 1817, said: "By making the passion of self-love beyond comparison stronger than the passion of benevolence, the more ignorant are led to pursue the general happiness, an end which they would have totally failed to attain if the moving principle of their conduct had been benevolence."²³⁶

Adam Smith in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* said:

²³³ *Works* (1826), Vol. 7, p. 383.

²³⁴ Hammond, *Town Labourer*, p. 200.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 198, 199.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

“The rich only select from the heap what is most precious and agreeable. They consume little more than the poor, and in spite of their natural selfishness and rapacity, though they mean only their own convenience, they divide with the poor the produce of all their improvements. They are led by an invisible hand to make nearly the same distribution . . . as if the earth had been divided into equal portions among all its inhabitants.”

As late as 1856 a volume was published by Francis Bowen, Professor of Moral Philosophy in Harvard College, in which the author said:

“Society is a complex and delicate machine, the real Author and Governor of which is divine. Men are often his agents, who do his work and know it not. He turneth their selfishness to good; and ends which could not be accomplished by the greatest sagacity, the most enlightened and disinterested public spirit, and the most strenuous exertions of human legislators and governors, are effected directly and incessantly, even through the ignorance, the wilfulness, and the avarice of men. Man cannot interfere with His work without marring it. The attempts of legislators to turn the industry of society in one direction or another, out of its natural and self-chosen channels . . . are almost invariably productive of harm. *Laissez-faire*; ‘these things regulate themselves,’ in common phrase; which means, of course, that God regulates them by his general laws, which always, in the long run, work to good. In these modern days, the ruler or governor who is most to be dreaded is, not the tyrant, but the busybody. Let the course of trade and the condition of society alone, is the best advice which can be given to the legislator, the projector, and the reformer. Busy yourselves, if you must be busy, with individual cases of wrong, hardship, or suffering; but do

not meddle with the general laws of the universe."²³⁷

It now seems incredible that wise and good men once regarded poverty not only as inevitable but as desirable. Yet it is possible for a present-day historian to devote an entire chapter to "The Doctrine of the Utility of Poverty."²³⁸ The prevailing theory was well summarized by Arthur Young in these words: "Every one but an idiot knows that the lower classes must be kept poor or they will never be industrious."²³⁹ Bernard Mandeville declared that "to make society happy, it is necessary that great numbers should be wretched as well as poor."²⁴⁰ Dr. Patrick Colquhoun once said: "Without a large proportion of poverty there could be no riches, since riches are the offspring of labour, while labour can only exist in a state of poverty. Poverty is therefore a most necessary and indispensable ingredient of society, without which nations and communities could not exist in a state of civilization."²⁴¹ In 1828 the philanthropist Michael Thomas Sadler declared that "poverty is the great weight which keeps the social machine going; remove that, and the gilded hands would not long be seen to move aloft, nor the melodious chimes be heard again."²⁴² The Reverend Joseph Townsend pointed out that "all manufacturers

²³⁷ *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 22, 23.

²³⁸ Professor Edgar S. Furniss, of Yale University, *The Position of the Labourer in a System of Nationalism*, chap. 6.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

²⁴⁰ *The Fable of the Bees*, 1924 edition, p. 193.

²⁴¹ Quoted by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Whither Mankind*, edited by C. A. Beard, p. 116.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 116.

agree that the poor are seldom diligent except when labour is cheap and corn is dear."²⁴³ Sir William Petty is on record as saying that the way "to render a people sober, temperate, and industrious is to render provisions dear so as to deprive them of any opportunity to be either idle or debauched."²⁴⁴

An anonymous writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1739 said: "We may justly infer that the reduction of wages in the wool manufacturers would be a national blessing and advantage, and no real injury to the poor." The Reverend Josiah Tucker, Dean of Gloucester and one of the most famous clergymen of the day, expressed the opinion that "if the price of labour is continually beat down, it is greatly for the public good."²⁴⁵

Not a few writers of that period proved to their own satisfaction not merely that poverty is inevitable and desirable but that it is really a blessing. After all, the poor have less responsibility and fewer anxieties than the rich. One writer described the blessings of poverty in these words: "O ye children of poverty and toil, of misfortune and sorrow! God is better to you than ye know. Ye see but one side of the veil now, and that is fretted with troubles, and dark with adversity. But it has another side. On that side are angel faces and the smile of God. Your crowns are gathering lustre. Your harps are being attuned to sweeter notes and deeper melodies of joy." This same point of view was expressed by another theologian

²⁴³ Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

in these words: "Never mind: if you cannot have a piano on earth, you may have a harp in heaven."

"Some of the necessities," says William Paley, Archdeacon of Carlisle, "which poverty imposes, are not hardships but pleasures. Frugality itself is a pleasure. . . . There is no pleasure in taking out of a large unmeasured fund. . . . A yet more serious advantage which persons in inferior stations possess is the ease with which they provide for their children. All the provision which a poor man's child requires is two words, 'industry and innocence.' With these qualities, tho' without a shilling to set him forwards, he goes into the world prepared to become a useful, virtuous, and happy man."²⁴⁶

In 1828 appeared the forty-first edition of *Sermons on the Doctrines and Duties of Christianity*, by Henrietta Maria Bowdler, dedicated to the Bishop of Lincoln. In this volume we find the following observations: "We are never taught to view this world as a state of happiness. . . . Our business here is to prepare for heaven. . . . Why one man was born a king, and another a beggar, is known to God alone. . . . I believe it will be found that the rich are not to be envied, and that those are happiest whom Providence has placed in an humbler station. . . . It is the duty of the poor to be contented and never to murmur at the dispensations of Providence."²⁴⁷

Edmund Burke once said: "The body of the common people . . . must respect that property which they cannot partake. They must labour to obtain

²⁴⁶ *Reasons for Contentment*, pp. 11, 12.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 155-162.

what by labour can be obtained; and when they find, as they commonly do, the success disproportioned to the endeavour, they must be taught their consolation in the final proportions of eternal justice.”²⁴⁸

The philanthropist and reformer Wilberforce, in his *Practical Views of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians*, reminds the poor “that their more lowly path has been allotted to them by the hand of God; that it is their part faithfully to discharge its duties, and contentedly to bear its inconveniences; that the present state of things is very short . . . that the peace of mind, which religion offers indiscriminately to all ranks, affords more true satisfaction than all the expensive pleasures which are beyond the poor man’s reach . . . that ‘having food and raiment, they should be therewith content,’ since their situation in life, with all its evils, is better than they have deserved at the hand of God. . . . Such are the blessed effects of Christianity on the temporal well-being of political communities.”²⁴⁹

Relief, not prevention, was the prevailing method of dealing with physical destitution.²⁵⁰ Many Christians of the day were generous with their alms and a few sought to deal with the fundamental causes of distress. But the vast proportion of religious people regarded poverty as a necessity, and many looked upon it as a blessing.²⁵¹ The various reform measures

²⁴⁸ *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, p. 359.

²⁴⁹ American edition of 1829, pp. 274, 275.

²⁵⁰ See R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 253-273, “The New Medicine for Poverty.”

²⁵¹ See Hammond, *The Town Labourer*, chap. 10, “The Mind of the Rich.”

were usually opposed by Christian men of property. Times without number the argument was advanced that low wages, long hours, and the employment of children were absolutely necessary if plants and factories were to be kept running. A manufacturer named Pease declared that "if the hours of labour were abridged, he must, unless he submitted to torture and overdrive the children, inevitably close his manufactory." A mine owner expressed the opinion that "without the employment of child-labour, the pits could not possibly be worked with profit; that after a certain age the vertebræ of the back do not conform to the required positions, and therefore the children must begin early, and that unless early inured to the work and its terrors no child would ever make a good collier."

When the workers in desperation sought to form trade unions for collective action they met with combined opposition from the employers and the statesmen. The infamous Combination Laws of 1799 and 1800 made it a crime for two workmen to combine in order to get an increase in wages or a decrease in hours.²⁵² As early as 1786 five London bookbinders were sentenced to two years' imprisonment for leading a strike to reduce hours from twelve to eleven.²⁵³ Seventeen tanners at Bermondsey in 1834 were sentenced to imprisonment for the offense of leaving their work unfinished. In 1834 seven Dorchester labourers, including two itinerant preachers, were given the monstrous sentence of seven years' trans-

²⁵² See Hammond, *The Town Labourer*, pp. 112-142.

²⁵³ Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *History of Trade Unions*, p. 79.

portation to Botany Bay for the sole crime of administering oaths as a part of the ritual of the Friendly Society of Agricultural Labourers.²⁵⁴ Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, publicly suggested the village horsepond as a fit destination for union organizers.²⁵⁵

Concerning the attitude of the churches toward social reform, Lord Shaftesbury, one of the foremost advocates of protective legislation for workers, said: "I find that Evangelical religionists are not those on whom I can rely. . . . To whom should I have naturally looked for the chief aid! Why, undoubtedly to the clergy, and especially those of the trading districts. Quite the reverse; from them I have received no support, or next to none. And this throughout my whole career. . . . I have had more aid from the medical than the divine profession." In describing the frame of mind which prevailed during this period Harold Begbie said: "Nearly every suggestion for bettering the condition of the poor was regarded as blasphemous republicanism and treated with a wrathful disdain. . . . Religion, politics, art, even literature, struck no blow for justice and advance."

(5) *Slavery*

It is beyond the power of imagination to measure the volume of human misery caused by chattel slavery. From the earliest dawn of history down to the day before yesterday man enslaved man, and even now the practice prevails in a variety of forms.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

Throughout all ages the institution of slavery has received the sanction and support of wise and good people. Paul seemed to have tacitly accepted it. For fifteen centuries the Christian church was horribly entangled in the system. *True enough, Christianity was primarily responsible for the removal of many of the worst excesses of the institution and not a few of the ablest abolitionists were nurtured in the church.*²⁵⁶ But there can be no doubt that slavery would have disappeared centuries before it did if it had not been buttressed by the support of the churches. The institution gradually died out in various parts of Europe from the Sixth Century onward or was merged into serfdom, although it never disappeared completely. In the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries, however, the slave trade was revived and grew enormously in dimensions.

The early Christians manifested much kindness and generosity to slaves but they did not condemn slavery outright. It was not until the Ninth Century that St. Theodore of Studium came forth with the positive command: "Thou shalt possess no slave, neither for domestic service nor for the labour of the fields, for man is made in the image of God."²⁵⁷ Indeed, the record is clear that churchmen frequently owned slaves themselves. A Fourth Century law forbade the sale of Christian female slaves except to Christian masters.²⁵⁸ Theodore, Archbishop of Can-

²⁵⁶ See Brace, *Gesta Christi*, pp. 41-71; 224-252; also Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol. 2, pp. 70 ff.; also Churchill Babington, *The Influence of Christianity in Promoting the Abolition of Slavery in Europe*, p. 167.

²⁵⁷ Quoted by Brace, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

terbury at the end of the Seventh Century, permitted the sale of children by fathers in cases of dire necessity.²⁵⁹

In a notable chapter on the history of slavery Professor Westermarck says:

“Not one of the Fathers even hints that slavery is unlawful or improper. In the early age martyrs possessed slaves, and so did abbots, bishops, popes, monasteries and churches. . . . So little was the abolition of slavery thought of that a Council at Orleans, in the middle of the Sixth Century, expressly decreed the perpetuity of servitude among the descendants of slaves. . . . As late as the Nineteenth Century the right of enslaving captives was defended by Bishop Bouvier. . . . Throughout Christendom the purchase and the sale of men, as property transferred from vendor to buyer, was recognized as a legal transaction of the same validity with the sale of other merchandise, land or cattle.”²⁶⁰

Concerning the practices of the church, Professor Coulton says: “More serious were the not infrequent papal decrees of slavery against papal enemies. Boniface VIII, in his feud against the Colonna family, held this punishment over them (1303). Clement V condemned to slavery the whole population of Venice (1309); Gregory XI, a couple of generations later, the Florentines; a generation later again, Sixtus IV and Julius II decreed the same fate against Florence, Bologna and Venice; and Paul III, when Henry VIII repudiated him, condemned all Englishmen to

²⁵⁹ Babington, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

²⁶⁰ E. A. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, Vol. 1, pp. 694-697.

servitude who took the king's part."²⁶¹ Even though these sentences were never fully carried out, they indicated an inhuman attitude toward enemies.

The record of the churches of the United States with regard to slavery is a shameful one. It is true that Christians were sharply divided in sentiment concerning this question. Some religious groups, notably the Quakers, and many individuals were consistently and vigorously opposed to slavery and many of the leaders in the antislavery movement were devout churchmen. But after due allowance is made for all these the fact remains that the churches of the South were ardent defenders of slavery, while those of the North in their corporate capacity were timid, evasive, and inconsistent. Before going into the details of this record, let us summarize some of the worst features of American slavery.

In the eyes of the law the slave was not a person, but a thing or piece of property. He was compelled to labour for his master and to render him obedience. He had no *right* to possess anything, although many exceptions were made by benevolent owners. He had no adequate safeguards against the cruelty of his master. He had no right of control over his family life, being unable to contract a legal marriage and helpless to protect his wife or children. He had no right of education or religious instruction; and finally he had no right to obtain his freedom.²⁶²

While it is an unquestionable fact that many

²⁶¹ G. G. Coulton, *The Medieval Village*, p. 169.

²⁶² See Wm. Goodell, *The American Slave Code*; and J. C. Hurd, *The Law of Freedom and Bondage*.

owners were kindly and considerate in their provisions for their slaves, it is equally true that many were careless and cruel. Excessively long hours of labour under the most adverse conditions, inadequate and improper food, unsanitary housing, and the use of the whip were commonplace. Slaves were often horribly mutilated and not infrequently killed by owners and overseers. Slave girls and women were at the mercy of their masters, receiving no protection from the law or public opinion. Concubinage and promiscuity prevailed on a widespread scale. Husbands and wives were frequently separated, and children were sometimes exported to distant regions.

The following advertisement appeared in the *Georgia Messenger*, July 27, 1837: "Ran away, my man Fountain—has holes bored in his ears, a scar on the right side of his forehead—has been shot in hind parts of his legs—is marked on the back with the whip."²⁶³

Abner Ross, of Fairfield District, South Carolina, offered a twenty-dollar reward as follows: "Ran away from the subscriber a negro girl named Molly. She is 16 or 17 years of age, slim made, lately branded on the left cheek, thus R, and a piece taken off of her ear on the same side; the same letter on the inside of both her legs."²⁶⁴

The *Charleston Courier*, on February 12, 1835, published the following advertisement: "By Thomas Gadsen. On Tuesday the 17th inst., will be sold at the north of the Exchange at ten o'clock A.M., a prime

²⁶³Quoted by Samuel Brooke, *Slavery and the Slaveholder's Religion*.

²⁶⁴*Ibid.*

gang of ten negroes, accustomed to the culture of cotton and provisions, belonging to the Independent Church, in Christ's Church Parish."²⁶⁵

In the Mercier *Luminary* J. Cable once wrote:

"Those who know anything about slavery, know that the worst kind is jobbing slavery—that is, the hiring out of slaves from year to year. What shocked me more than anything else was the church engaged in this jobbing of slaves. The college church which I attended, and which was attended by all the students of Hamden Sydney College and Union Theological Seminary (Va.), held slaves enough to pay their pastor, Mr. Stanton, one thousand dollars a year. The slaves, who had been left to the church by some pious mother in Israel, had increased so as to be a large and still increasing fund. These were hired out on Christmas day of each year, the day in which they celebrate the birth of our blessed Saviour, to the highest bidder. There were four other churches near the College Church that supported the pastor, in whole or in part, in the same way."²⁶⁶

The whole system was so utterly inhuman that it seems incredible that it should have survived so long. Yet men and women with keen intellects and broad sympathies devoted themselves passionately to the defense and perpetuation of this vile institution. Three primary arguments were used endlessly: slavery is good for the slaves; it is good for the owners; and it is divine in its origin.

It was considered axiomatic that Negroes were an inferior race and that without the leadership of white

²⁶⁵Quoted by Parker Pillsbury *The Church as It Is*, p. 70.

²⁶⁶*Ibid.*, p. 69.

people they could never rise above barbarism. Professor Thomas R. Dew, of William and Mary College, based a long argument on the proposition that "slaves are entirely unfit for a state of freedom among the whites." Chancellor William Harper once declared that "the Creator did not intend that every individual human being should be highly cultivated morally and intellectually. . . . It is better that a part should be fully and highly cultivated, and the rest utterly ignorant."²⁶⁷

Governor J. H. Hammond once said: "I endorse without reserve the much abused sentiment of Governor McDuffie, that 'slavery is the corner-stone of our republican edifice'; while I repudiate, as ridiculously absurd, that much lauded but nowhere accredited dogma of Mr. Jefferson that 'all men are born equal.'"²⁶⁸

That slavery was the black man's best friend was often maintained. Chancellor William Harper quoted with enthusiasm from an article which said: "Slavery has done more to elevate a degraded race in the scale of humanity; to tame the savage; to civilize the barbarous; to soften the ferocious; to enlighten the ignorant, and to spread the blessings of Christianity among the heathen, than all the missionaries that philanthropy and religion have ever sent forth."²⁶⁹

The Reverend James Wilson called slavery "that gracious and benevolent system which elevates the heathen cannibal into the contented, civilized,

²⁶⁷ *The Pro-Slavery Argument*, p. 35. (1853, 490 pages.)

²⁶⁸ Hammond's *Letters on Slavery*, pp. 109, 110.

²⁶⁹ *The Pro-Slavery Argument*, p. 60.

intelligent, and happy domestics we see around us. Nay more, into humble, faithful, and most joyous worshippers of the true and everlasting God. Bless God for such a system. We don't apologize for slavery, we glory in it, and no society shall exist within our borders that disqualifies or stigmatizes the slave trade."²⁷⁰

The Reverend T. T. Castleman, Rector of Trinity Church, Staunton, Virginia, published a volume in 1853 entitled *Plain Sermons for Servants*, with an introduction by Bishop William Meade. In this book we find the following sentiment: "God knows better than you do, whether it is best for you to be rich or poor, high or low, in bondage or in liberty. . . . Had he left you to choose your state in life for yourself, you might have made a choice that would ruin you forever. . . . You must obey your masters when they speak; for God hath placed them over you." The last sermon in this volume is entitled, "The Faithful Christian Shall Wear a Crown."

In a sermon to slaves the Reverend Theophilus Clapp of New Orleans said: "The burden of your care, toils, and responsibilities is much lighter than that which God has imposed on your master. The most enlightened philanthropist, with unlimited resources, could not place you in a situation more favourable to your present and everlasting welfare than that which you now occupy."²⁷¹

That slavery was ordained by God was the un-

²⁷⁰Report of the Anti-Slavery Society of New York, 1860, p. 281.

²⁷¹Quoted by Harriet Beecher Stowe, *A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Vol. I, p. 106.

wavering belief of most Southern churchmen.²⁷² In 1852 appeared the fifth edition of a volume by the Reverend Josiah Priest entitled *Bible Defence of Slavery*. A total of 469 pages is devoted to proving the thesis that slavery came from God. "I firmly believe," said Governor J. H. Hammond, "that American slavery is not only not a sin, but especially commanded by God through Moses, and approved by Christ through his apostles."²⁷³

In 1858, during the course of a debate with another minister, the Reverend W. G. Brownlow said: "Not only will I throughout this discussion openly and boldly take the ground that Slavery as it exists in America ought to be perpetuated, but that slavery is an established and inevitable condition to human society. I will maintain the ground that God always intended the relation of master and slave to exist . . . that slavery having existed ever since the first organization of society, it will exist to the end of time."²⁷⁴

The Reverend J. C. Postell, of Orangeburgh, South Carolina, once declared: "So far from being a moral evil, slavery is a merciful visitation. . . . It is the Lord's doings, and it is marvellous in our eyes; and had it not been for the best God alone, who is able, long since would have overruled it. It is by divine appointment."²⁷⁵ The Reverend Doctor

²⁷² See Henry Wilson (Vice President of the United States), *The Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*, 3 vols., 2164 pages; especially Vol. 3, pp. 697-724; also C. B. Swaney, *Episcopal Methodism and Slavery*.

²⁷³ Governor Hammond's *Letters to Thomas Clarkson*, p. 5.

²⁷⁴ *Ought American Slavery to Be Perpetuated?* A Debate between Rev. W. G. Brownlow and Reverend A. Pryne, 305 pages.

²⁷⁵ Quoted by Stephen S. Foster, *The Brotherhood of Thieves*.

Smythe of Charleston said: "The war now carried on by the North is a war against slavery, and is, therefore, treasonable rebellion against the Constitution of the United States, and against the Word, providence, and government of God."²⁷⁶ On Thanksgiving Day, 1860, in the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans, the pastor, Dr. B. M. Palmer, expressed the conviction that it was the "providential trust" of the Southern people "to conserve and to perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as now existing. . . . The position of the South is at this moment sublime. If she has grace given her to know her hour, she will save herself, the country and the world."²⁷⁷

After quoting the statement of the Reverend Dr. Bachman, outstanding Lutheran minister of Charleston, in referring to "that unexampled unanimity of sentiment that now exists in the whole South on the subject of slavery," Dr. Leonard Bacon, a church historian, says:

"There seems to be no reason to doubt the entire sincerity with which the Southern church, in all its sects, had consecrated itself with religious devotion to the maintenance of that horrible and inhuman form of slavery which had drawn upon itself the condemnation of the civilized world. The common sentiment of southern Christianity was expressed in that serious declaration of the Southern Presbyterian Church during the war of its 'deep conviction of the divine appointment of domestic servitude' and of the 'pe-

²⁷⁶Quoted by Wilson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 704.

²⁷⁷*Slavery a Divine Trust*, by B. M. Palmer, pp. 7, 19.

cular mission of the Southern church to conserve the institution of slavery.’”²⁷⁸

Not only was slavery defended, to bear testimony against it was regarded as impious and unpatriotic. In dedicating a church building in Charleston in 1850 the Reverend J. H. Thornwell, a distinguished Presbyterian clergyman who was sometimes called the “Calhoun of the Church,” said: “The Parties in this conflict are not merely abolitionists and slaveholders—they are atheists, socialists, communists, red republicans, jacobins, on the one side, and the friends of order and regulated freedom on the other. In one word, the world is the battle ground—Christianity and Atheism the combatants; and the progress of humanity the stake.”²⁷⁹

This same procedure of labelling antislavery advocates with all the objectionable epithets then current was followed by the Honourable James Wilson, American Minister to Turkey. In one category he grouped “the advocates of ‘free love,’ the ‘Socialists,’ the Infidels, the ‘Red Republicans,’ and ‘Abolitionists.’ . . . But for the professed teacher of God’s Holy Word; for the man who claims to be a disciple of Christ, and a follower of His holy counsels, but who prostitutes the pulpit to the purpose of inciting hatred instead of love . . . who teaches his congregation that all the other sins of the world are as nothing compared to the sin of slavery—who can regard him in any other aspect than as the enemy . . . of that

²⁷⁸*History of American Christianity*, p. 346.

²⁷⁹*The Rights and the Duties of Masters*, p. 14.

meek and lowly Jesus whom he professes to serve?"²⁸⁰

The Reverend Robert N. Anderson, in a letter to the West Hanover Presbytery, said: "Now, dear Christian brethren . . . if there be any stray goat of a minister among you, tainted with the blood-hound principles of abolitionism, let him be ferreted out, silenced, excommunicated, and left to the public to dispose of him in other respects. Your affectionate brother in the Lord."²⁸¹ The New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church in 1836 resolved that "we are decidedly of the opinion that none ought to be elected to the office of a deacon or elder in our church, unless he give a pledge to the Conference that he will refrain from agitating the church on the subject of slavery."²⁸²

For many years prior to the Civil War it was highly dangerous to speak against slavery anywhere in the South. Ministers and teachers found their positions jeopardized and their lives threatened if it became known that they were sympathetic with the antislavery movement. Large rewards were offered for the capture dead or alive of certain noted abolitionists. Many post offices refused to deliver anti-slavery literature, this procedure being defended by at least two Postmaster Generals of the United States. In a letter of indorsement to the Postmaster of Charleston, Postmaster General Kendall said: "We owe an obligation to the laws, but a higher one to the communities in which we live, and if the

²⁸⁰*The South Vindicated*, pp. 70, 143, 144.

²⁸¹Quoted by Stowe, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 243.

²⁸²Quoted by William Goodell, *Slavery and Antislavery*, p. 428.

former be perverted to destroy the latter, it is patriotism to disregard them.”²⁸³

Postmaster General Holt wrote to the postmaster at Falls church, Virginia, concerning antislavery literature as follows: “The people of Virginia may not only forbid the introduction and dissemination of such documents within their borders, but, if brought there in the mails, they may, by appropriate legal proceedings, have them destroyed. They have the same right to extinguish firebrands thus impiously hurled into the midst of their homes and altars, that a man has to pluck the burning fuse from a bombshell which is about to explode at his feet.”²⁸⁴

Mob violence occurred frequently, both in the South and in the North. The classic assault upon Garrison by Bostonians of property and standing was not an isolated case. Vice President Henry Wilson in his monumental history has gathered together a mass of evidence on this point.²⁸⁵ In Philadelphia, New York, Cincinnati, Utica, New Bedford, Nantucket, Portland, St. Louis, and other cities violence was used against the persons and property of abolitionists. Concerning the situation which prevailed throughout the South, Wilson said:

“The proscription, lawlessness and barbarism of slavery were the necessary conditions of its existence. . . . The mob was sovereign. . . . A merciless vindictiveness prevailed, and held its stern and pitiless

²⁸³Quoted by William Henry Smith, *A Political History of Slavery*, p. 43.

²⁸⁴W. L. Garrison, *The New Reign of Terror*, p. 9.

²⁸⁵*Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 666-672; vol. 1, p. 662.

control over the whole South. . . . Southern papers were filled with accounts of the atrocities perpetrated, and volumes alone would contain descriptions of all that transpired during this reign of terror. . . . The Texas 'Advocate,' the organ of the Methodist Church South, urged 'the thorough and immediate eradication of the Methodist Church North in Texas, with whatever force may be necessary.' If such were the teachings of their religious journals, little surprise need be felt that the mob reigned, and reigned ruthlessly."²⁸⁶

In many cases where slavery was not defended outright, churches were silent or evasive on the whole question. For example, the Georgia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church once went on record as follows: "*Resolved*, That we view slavery as a civil and domestic institution, and one with which, as ministers of Christ, we have nothing to do."²⁸⁷ The Charleston Baptist Association memorialized the State Legislature as follows: "The said Association does not consider that the holy scriptures have made the fact of slavery a question of morals at all."²⁸⁸ The South Carolina Conference resolved: "Whereas, we hold that the subject of slavery in these United States is not one proper for the action of the church, but is exclusively appropriate to the civil authorities. Therefore, that this conference will not intermeddle with it."²⁸⁹

The policy of evasion frequently prevailed in the

²⁸⁶*Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 666, 667.

²⁸⁷Quoted by Harriet Beecher Stowe, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 221.

²⁸⁸Goodell, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

²⁸⁹*Ibid.*, p. 222.

North also. In 1836 the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church at Cincinnati declared that they "wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention, to interfere with the civil and political relation of master and slave, as it exists in the slaveholding States of the Union."²⁹⁰ In 1845 the General Association of the Presbyterian church "recognized no responsibility on the part of the church to remove the evils connected with slavery."²⁹¹ Two years later this body voted it "inexpedient and improper for it to attempt or propose measures of emancipation."²⁹²

Thus it is evident that the churches in their corporate capacity, as well as individual ministers and officials, have often maintained attitudes, engaged in practices, and upheld institutions which sharply contradicted the fundamental principles of Jesus' way of life. In every age since Christianity became powerful the churches have sanctioned and perpetuated terrible iniquities. Ecclesiastics high and low with appalling frequency have been guilty of unspeakable cruelties. The life of many an ancient evil was prolonged for centuries because of the support of devout Christians.

Perhaps it may be advisable for me to repeat what I said at the outset. This volume is merely a study in *contrasts*. It is not a history of Christianity. It is not an evaluation of the relative good and evil in the history of the churches. *It is not the whole story*. It is merely an examination of certain attitudes and prac-

²⁹⁰ Goodell, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-146.

²⁹¹ Goodell, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

²⁹² Thompson, *Presbyterian Church*, p. 136.

tices on the part of Christians which constitute conspicuous violations of the spirit and teaching of Jesus.

My purpose is to shed light on the question as to why Christianity has not been more successful in uprooting giant evils and why it is so often paralyzed in times of crisis. Christians believe that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation." Nineteen hundred years have passed since the good news was first proclaimed. Yet we are still surrounded by terrible iniquities. *The evidence cited herein constitutes a partial explanation of the relative impotence of Christianity.* Compromise with and acceptance of pagan attitudes, practices, and institutions account for the weakness of the churches. The influence of the religion of Jesus has often been nullified by the adherents of a denatured religion called Christianity.

CHAPTER IV

CONTRASTS BETWEEN CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIANITY AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS

THAT historical Christianity has often abandoned and violated the religion of Jesus is undeniable. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the present-day record of Christians and to point out certain conspicuous contradictions between their practices and the spirit of Jesus. I shall confine myself strictly to this study in contrasts. A voluminous literature in which the advances and triumphs of the churches are recorded is already available. The progress of mankind and the achievements of Western civilization have likewise been described in numerous volumes.¹ *That tremendous strides forward have been taken is not open to question.* It is altogether probable that the number of persons now alive who have a clear understanding of the religion of Jesus and its significance is greater than at any period since his crucifixion. Nevertheless, there is still a vast chasm between the lives of most Christians and that of the Nazarene carpenter.

¹See *Whither Mankind*, edited by Charles A. Beard; *Recent Gains in American Civilization*, edited by Kirby Page.

I. THE WAR SYSTEM

It is common knowledge that vast numbers of Christians were enrolled in the contending armies of the World War. With rare exceptions Christians supported their respective governments. In all countries there were a few pacifists but not many. As a rule, ministers and laymen alike gave their blessing and support to the war. Thousands of sermons on both sides of the line upheld the righteousness of the cause of their own nation.

The German clergy with few exceptions followed the leadership of the Kaiser and his staff. Ethical justifications of the war poured forth in a mighty stream. A former Chancellor of the University of Tübingen said that "the entire chapter of the duties of love, which is the chief doctrine of the moral law, has no application to the conduct of the state. A nation depends, not upon the love of others, but upon the love of self, upon the fostering and development of its own power and prosperity." Early in the war Pastor Lober of Leipzig wrote: "We beflag our houses, we ring our bells, and sing 'Now thank we all our God' when countless multitudes of Russians meet a terrible death in the Masurian swamps, or when two thousand seamen are plunged to the bottom of the ocean by our submarines. And such expressions of gratitude and joy are genuinely German and genuinely Christian."²

There were a few conscientious objectors in the Allied countries but they constituted only a negligible

²Quoted by R. J. Campbell, *The War and the Soul*, p. 61.

fraction of the population. The churches were unitedly and enthusiastically behind their governments. Christians by the million enrolled in the Allied armies and the voice of the clergy was almost unanimous in calling down the blessings of God upon them. In 1915 the Dean of Durham, in referring to the attitude of the British churches, wrote: "Happily for themselves the clergy have, almost universally, shared the general conviction as to the justice of the War, and as to the moral obligation under which the Nation lies to prosecute it to a successful conclusion." Lyman Abbott, editor of *The Outlook* and one of the most beloved and highly honoured ministers of the United States, published a volume in 1918 in which he said:

"It is a disgrace to a noble profession to call the German officers soldiers or the German forces an army. They are in the strictest sense of that term brigands, for they constitute a highly organized gang engaged in highway robbery on an enormous scale. The armies of the Allies are in the strictest sense of that term 'officers of the peace.' They are 'fighting for peace.' They might well bear upon their banners the inscription, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.' . . . In this letter I desire to explain to you (a mother whose son was in the army) the ground of my faith that Jesus Christ calls his followers to the colors and that their response to the call constitutes a triumph for Christianity such as the world has never before known."³

At the beginning of the war Newell Dwight Hillis was one of the most renowned clergymen in the

³*The Twentieth Century Crusade*, pp. 33, 34, 37.

country. In his book, *The Blot on the Kaiser's 'Scutcheon* the publishers inserted the following note: "During the past year beginning October 1, 1917, Dr. Hillis, in addition to his work in Plymouth church, and as president of the Plymouth Institute, has visited no less than 162 cities and made some 400 addresses." The nature of these numerous patriotic addresses is indicated by the following passage from the above-mentioned volume:

"These men (former pacifists, etc.) feel that there is no longer any room in the world for the German . . . lovers of their fellow-men have finally become perfectly hopeless with reference to the German people. They have no more relation to the civilization of 1918 than an orang-outang, a gorilla, a Judas, a hyena, a thumbscrew, a scalping knife in the hands of a savage. These brutes must be cast out of society. . . . In utter despair, therefore, statesmen, generals, diplomats, editors are not talking about the duty of simply exterminating the German people. There will shortly be held a meeting of surgeons in this country. . . . These surgeons are preparing to advocate the calling of a world conference to consider the sterilization of the ten million German soldiers, and the segregation of their women, that when this generation of German goes, civilized cities, states, and races may be rid of this awful cancer that must be cut clean out of the body of society."⁴

It was to this clergyman that Theodore Roosevelt referred when he said: "I would rather have Dr. Hillis as chaplain than any other man I know."

The Executive Secretary of the New York Federation of Churches, after pointing out that "the war

⁴*The Twentieth Century Crusade*, pp. 56, 57, 59.

was a crusade to save Christian civilization," said that he was "encouraged to engage in anti-pacifist activities." He referred with enthusiasm to the fact that early in 1916 the clergy of New York City voted 190 to 25 in favour of armed preparedness and that two months before the United States entered the war 380 ministers of the city indorsed conscription. The president of the Federation, the venerable Nehemiah Boynton, said on April 4, 1918: "Our ministers are with the people in this great fight; and like the redeemed of the Lord in other relationships of life they are neither afraid nor ashamed to say so." On this occasion Mr. Walter Laidlaw referred with satisfaction to the fact that most of the ministers who opposed preparedness as late as May, 1916, were then supporting the war "as human, humane, and a crusade of the Kingdom of God."⁵

The famous evangelist, Billy Sunday, began a prayer in the House of Representatives in January, 1918, with these words: "Thou knowest, O Lord, that no nation so infamous, vile, greedy, sensuous, bloodthirsty ever disgraced the pages of History. Make bare thy mighty arm, O Lord, and smite the hungry, wolfish Hun, whose fangs drip with blood, and we will forever raise our voices in Thy praise." The suppliant had the satisfaction of hearing his prayer applauded by the House.⁶

Although nearly eleven years have passed since the close of the World War, the churches are still terribly entangled in the war system. Most Christians con-

⁵Walter Laidlaw, editor, *The Moral Aims of the War*, pp. 4, 5, 51.

⁶Granville Hicks, *The American Mercury*, February 1927, p. 138.

tinue to give their active or tacit support to armed preparedness. If the United States should declare war to-morrow the great majority of church members would probably aid vigorously in the prosecution of the combat, although the number of conscientious objectors would be incomparably larger than ever before. Christians by the thousand would enlist without any clear idea as to the real reasons why they are fighting. They would once more swallow the propaganda of misrepresentation and falsehood which is always issued by governments in war time.⁷ The god of war would again supplant the universal Father of mankind.

In spite of these facts, I am strongly convinced that *it is entirely possible to disentangle the churches of the United States from the war system within the next few decades.*⁸ But this will not be accomplished unless there is first of all a clear realization of the extent to which they are now involved and the significance of the existing relationship between organized religion and the forces that make for war.

Perhaps the most effective way of revealing the dangerous tendencies in international affairs at the present time is to examine the causes of the World War. Fortunately, the evidence now available is rather complete. The most authoritative work on this question is that of Professor Sidney B. Fay, Professor

⁷See Arthur Ponsonby, *Falsehood in War Time*; Harold Lassowell, *Propaganda Technique in War Time*.

⁸The Second Study Conference of the Churches and World Peace, held at Columbus, Ohio, March 6-8, 1929, condemned war as sin and adopted an extraordinarily vigorous series of resolutions, copies of which may be secured free from the Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22d Street, New York City.

of European History at Smith College. His monumental two volumes, *The Origins of the World War*, are everywhere being acclaimed as the fairest and most comprehensive verdict of the historical scholarship. The primary underlying causes of the conflict are enumerated as follows: the system of secret alliances, militarism, nationalism, economic imperialism, and the newspaper press. The final conclusions reached by Professor Fay are summarized as follows:

“In the forty years following the Franco-Prussian War, as we have seen, there developed a system of alliances which divided Europe into two hostile groups. This hostility was accentuated by the increase of armaments, economic rivalry, nationalist ambitions and antagonisms, and newspaper incitement. But it is very doubtful whether all these dangerous tendencies would have actually led to war, had it not been for the assassination of Franz Ferdinand. That was the factor which consolidated the elements of hostility and started the rapid and complicated succession of events which culminated in a World War, and for that factor Serbian nationalism was primarily responsible.

“But the verdict of the Versailles Treaty that Germany and her allies were responsible for the War, in view of the evidence now available, is historically unsound. It should therefore be revised. . . .

“Germany did not plot a European War, did not want one, and made genuine, though too belated, efforts to avert one. She was the victim of her alliance with Austria and of her own folly. Austria was her only dependable ally, Italy and Roumania having become nothing but allies in name. She could not throw her over, as otherwise she would stand isolated between Russia, where Pan-slavism and armaments

were growing stronger every year, and France, where Alsace-Lorraine, Delcassè's fall, and Agadir were not forgotten. Therefore, Bethmann felt bound to accede to Berchtold's request for support and gave him a free hand to deal with Serbia; he also hoped and expected to 'localize' the Austro-Serbian conflict. . . .

"Germany's geographical position between France and Russia and her inferiority in number of troops had made necessary the plan of crushing the French army quickly at first and then turning against Russia. This was only possible, in the opinion of her strategists, by marching through Belgium, as it was generally anticipated by military men that she would do in case of a European War. . . .

"Russia was partly responsible for the Austro-Serbian conflict because of the frequent encouragement which she had given at Belgrade—that Serbian national unity would be ultimately achieved with Russian assistance at Austrian expense. This had led the Belgrade Cabinet to hope for Russian support in case of a war with Austria, and the hope did not prove vain in July, 1914. . . .

"Russia's responsibility lay also in the secret preparatory military measures which she was making at the same time that she was carrying on diplomatic negotiations. These alarmed Germany and Austria. But it was primarily Russia's general mobilization, made when Germany was trying to bring Austria to a settlement, which precipitated the final catastrophe, causing Germany to mobilize and declare war."⁹

Modern war is caused primarily by the clash between economic and political forces.¹⁰ The growth of industrialism makes it impossible for nations to

⁹Vol. 2, pp. 552-558.

¹⁰See *Dollars and World Peace*, by Kirby Page, for a fuller consideration of this problem.

live apart, each being dependent upon other regions for raw materials and food, markets and fields of investment. Rivalry for control of the economic resources of the earth has grown keener and keener. This commercial and financial competition is carried on in an atmosphere of suspicion and hostility created by nationalism. Every nation emphasizes the like-mindedness of its own citizens and stresses their differences from other peoples. Almost every group regards itself as superior; the consequent idea of the inferiority of all others leads to fear, contempt, and enmity.

The prevailing doctrine of national interest obligates a government to safeguard the lives, property, and interests of its citizens wherever jeopardized and by whatever means deemed necessary, thus leading to threats, intervention, occupation, and war. The dogma of national sovereignty prevents governments from coöperating heartily in creating international agencies through which disputes between nations may be settled peaceably. The duelling concept which underlies the prevailing doctrine of national honour arouses dangerous emotions in times of crisis, while the interpretation of national patriotism which obligates citizens to support their government in all controversies with other governments and to fight the duels of their country encourages aggression.¹¹ As a result of this combination, the great powers feel obliged to expend large sums upon armed preparedness, to erect economic barriers around their borders, and to control the political

¹¹For an illuminating discussion of this problem see *Essays on Nationalism*, by Carlton J. H. Hayes.

and economic life of industrially backward regions.

During recent years the United States has become highly industrialized, with the result that our citizens are now vitally concerned with the problems of raw materials, markets, and foreign investments. The total imports and exports of this country exceed nine billion dollars annually. Our foreign investments have risen from less than two billions to fifteen billions since 1913 and are increasing at the rate of from one to two billions annually. The United States now controls politically or dominates economically foreign territory embracing 911,012 square miles and inhabited by 21,756,000 people.¹²

That the government should protect the lives and property of our citizens in other lands seems axiomatic to most Americans. Nowhere is the doctrine of national sovereignty more jealously safeguarded than by the Senate of the United States. The duelling concept of national honour is widely prevalent, and the right-or-wrong brand of patriotism is deeply entrenched in our national life. Our chauvinistic press is not less bellicose than that of other countries. If this nation ever goes to war again it will not, in all probability, be for the purpose of repelling an actual invader but to protect our rights and interests and prestige against the inroads of some competing power. If the United States will take seriously the commitments of the Pact of Paris and coöperate vigorously in the creation of international agencies of justice, *the probability of our shores being invaded is so remote as not to be within the realm of practical states-*

¹² See Parker T. Moon, *Imperialism and World Politics*, p. 524.

manship. So far as this country is concerned, the fear of invasion is the creation of chauvinistic nationalism. Yet the whole superstructure of armed preparedness rests upon this false foundation. Why are the citizens of this nation spending upward of six hundred million dollars annually on the current expenses of the army and navy? Why do we maintain a chemical warfare branch of the army? Why have Federal appropriations for military training in civil schools increased fifteenfold during the past decade and a half and the number of students taking such courses increased fourfold during this period? Why are so many patriotic societies promoting preparedness campaigns? Why do taxpayers endure the burden of armaments? Fear, fear of invasion if we should fall behind in the race of armaments. At least this is the explanation most often advanced. Citizens of the United States resent the idea that the British and Japanese fleets are the primary reasons why we do not invade those lands; nevertheless, multitudes of our countrymen insist that our foreign policy must be based on the assumption that Great Britain, Japan, or some other nation would invade this country if they were not afraid of our navy and army.

The war system, in which the churches are so seriously entangled, emerges out of and is sustained by economic and political rivalries. That armaments constitute an irrational, ineffective, and suicidal method of seeking the settlement of complex international problems is so obvious that there is no need to labour the point. Yet the fact remains that as long as the war system is perpetuated as a means of main-

taining security against attack, it will actually be used as an instrument of national policy. Indeed, the General Naval Board of the United States Government in a recent statement declares that naval policy "is based on and is designed to support national policies and national interests. The navy of the United States should be maintained in sufficient strength to support its policies and its commerce." Although we have disavowed any intention of waging war except in self-defense, the General Board has outlined a plan "to develop and to organize the navy for operations in any part of either ocean."¹³ The only kind of war which the people of the United States are ever likely to be called upon to wage is the very kind that has been renounced in the Briand-Kellogg treaty. Because of the remote possibility that our shores may be invaded by a foreign foe, multitudes of Christians support the war system, with all its injustices and atrocities.

Many volumes could easily be filled with post-war indorsements of armed preparedness and justification of war by Christian clergymen and laymen. Pacifism—the utter rejection of war and the supreme reliance upon good will functioning through appropriate international agencies of justice—is still abhorrent to many Christians. "The war system," says one clergyman, "is a part of the government of the United States. Without it there is neither national security nor national honour. When you renounce any part of that system you are a rebel and to that

¹³Statement released to the press by Secretary Wilbur on Nov. 12, 1928.

degree a traitor. . . . War is not unchristian. Sometimes it is a Christian duty—a duty laid upon us by God and man.” This same writer refers to pacifism as “quintessential absurdity. To foster such a code is to nurture a serpent in the very bosom of the nation.” A well-known Protestant bishop says: “My oldest son has for the past two years been attending a military training school, with my full approval. I look upon it as part of his duty as a man and a Christian to be prepared to serve his country efficiently in time of need.” A Catholic bishop writes: “American Catholics will ever stand by the final decision of our Government, whether it be for or against war.” Another Protestant bishop says: “To take the position that one will never again sanction or participate in any way, even though it may be a war against evil, is to my mind foolish and unchristian.” Still another bishop declares: “I do not share the belief that all war is unchristian. . . . I would be ashamed to be an American if my country had not taken its part in the late war.” One of the most beloved of all bishops has recorded the opinion that “but for war on Germany, the world would now have been in Hell. There are, in my estimation, just wars, where righteousness is at stake.” A prominent clergyman declares that the sentence, “We will never again sanction nor participate in any war,” is “treason—damnable treason—and no true American citizen should sign it.”

An extreme illustration of the indorsement of war by clergymen is found in an article by the editor

of *Grace and Truth*, a Fundamentalist publication, for February, 1927, from which the following quotation is taken:

“The same God Who condemns Abimelech for the murder of a handful of men, encourages and applauds His chosen nation for the wholesale slaughter of multitudes of men, women, and children of an antagonistic nation. God does not give the individual man authority over the lives of his fellow men. God does give to a regularly constituted government authority to execute its criminals and slay its enemies. The Word of God unfailingly distinguishes between individual killing and national killing. . . . As King of Israel, David could send his armies into the field of battle and thousands of souls could be hurled into eternity with God’s approval. As King, David was the government. But as individual, David arranges for the death of one man, Uriah, and God charges him with murder, and brings upon him terrible chastening. National killing is approved by Scripture. Individual killing is designated murder in Scripture, and is repudiated by God. . . . The teaching of Jesus is a sweeping endorsement of national killing, and points to that awful hour when Jesus Himself shall bring a sword and establish His own government, fighting as He fought in ‘the day of battle,’ slaying His enemies with deadly slaughter, until the blood shall come out of the winepress of His wrath unto the horses’ bridles for one thousand and six hundred furlongs. . . . Yes, a Christian should bear arms in obedience to the command of the ruler, for the ruler is authorized of God to bear the sword, hence may delegate any of his citizens to represent the government in its military or naval operations. Yes, a Christian, when acting as the defender of the government, may slay the enemy and not be guilty of mur-

der, for he is personifying the higher power which bears the sword by divine ordinance. In the light of God's Word, Christians not only may fight, but Christians should fight when ordered to do so by the authorities of his nation."

The available evidence is irrefutable: many Christian ecclesiastics and institutions are still upholding and blessing the war system although it is well known that modern war is caused by conflicting economic and political interests and that men, women, and children, guilty and innocent, are slaughtered indiscriminately. *A change in attitude is rapidly taking place but much energy will be required before the churches can be persuaded to cut loose entirely from the war system.*

2. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Capital punishment by the state is founded upon the ancient principle of an eye for an eye which Jesus repudiated. Surely there is no place in God's Home for hanging or asphyxiation: yet many Christians vigorously uphold the death penalty for criminals adjudged guilty of murder and other serious crimes. Forty of the states of the Union retain the death penalty on their statute books.¹⁴ The two arguments used most often as a justification of capital punishment are these: justice demands that the life of a murderer be forfeited; and second, the execution of criminals found guilty of the most serious offenses is

¹⁴The eight states which have abolished capital punishment are: Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

necessary as a warning to other wrongdoers. A life for a life may be justice according to the laws of man, but this practice violates Jesus' gospel of love. That capital punishment is a real deterrent to crime is denied by many competent authorities. If the spectacle of a criminal being led to the scaffold is such an effective warning to other potential criminals, why not give maximum publicity to the hanging or electrocution of the victim? The actual procedure, however, is to execute the death sentence in secret, with only a few witnesses present. The experience of society invalidates the deterrent theory.

Many indorsements of capital punishment by members of the Christian church could easily be assembled. The House of Deputies of the Episcopal General Convention recently tabled a resolution condemning capital punishment. The question of the death penalty is rarely discussed in ecclesiastical assemblies and only at rare intervals is this practice condemned. Statements similar to the following appear frequently and are unchallenged by most Christians: "The murderer has forfeited his life in the taking of the life of another. Let the punishment fit the crime and prove a warning to all malefactors." "We must terrorize the criminals as they are attempting to terrorize us." "It is the finality of the death penalty which instils fear into the heart of every murderer, and it is this fear of punishment which protects society. I believe society should have no hesitation in springing the trap every time the noose can be put around a murderer's neck."

Christmas is supposed to be a memorial to the

Great Teacher who practised returning good for evil and who incarnated the principle of manifesting love toward enemies, yet we read in an American newspaper: "Uncle Sam is going to make sure beyond a doubt that your Christmas mail will be delivered this year without a chance of its being stolen. He has put the marines on the job to take uncertainty out of the matter. . . . They have orders to shoot to kill, and if there is any doubt shoot first and ask questions afterward." Some months ago an Associated Press dispatch read: "Richard Evans, aged 19, paid with his life to-day for the murder of a Chicago policeman. He was hanged at the Cook County jail at 7:10 o'clock." And yet the President of the United States recently declared: "One of our chief characteristics is a profound reverence for humanity."

The famous Sacco-Vanzetti trial brought the question of capital punishment into the very forefront of public discussion. Many Christians were prominent in the effort to prevent the execution of these men, but a vastly larger number of Christian ministers and laymen believed that the convicted anarchists should be electrocuted, although many competent authorities seriously questioned their guilt and presented evidence that they had not received a fair trial. Wherever groups of pious and learned men and women were gathered together during the crisis of this celebrated case one could hear impassioned demands for the execution of the prisoners. I have reason to remember a sermon against capital punishment which I preached in a mid-Western city a few days before

Sacco and Vanzetti were electrocuted. Many of the most earnest Christians in the congregation were highly indignant that a plea against the execution of "dangerous and subversive" persons should be made from the pulpit of their church. For days these religious people gave vent to their feelings of resentment against those who sought to abolish the death penalty.

Since I am limiting myself in this chapter to an emphasis upon the contrasts between contemporaneous Christianity and the religion of Jesus, I shall not enter into a discussion of the causes and cure of crime. Fortunately, several satisfactory treatments of this problem are available.¹⁵ The evidence seems to validate my thesis that the attitude of many Christians toward capital punishment constitutes a serious violation of the spirit and teaching of Jesus.

3. RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND LYNCHING

In word and deed Jesus transcended racial barriers. Citizen of a narrow and bigoted community, he shocked his contemporaries by mingling freely with "outcasts" and "inferiors" of other races and by choosing an alien Samaritan as the hero of one of his most significant parables. The attitude of most white Christians in the United States to-day toward the other races is much nearer to that of the scandalized Jews of old Jerusalem than to the practices of

¹⁵ See E. Roy Calvert, *Capital Punishment in the Twentieth Century*; Harry Elmer Barnes, *The Repression of Crime*; Clarence Darrow, *Crime, Its Causes and Treatment*; John L. Gillin, *Criminology and Penology*.

the carpenter of Nazareth. That men of all races are brothers and should treat each other as members of a common family is accepted as a theory but not as a standard of daily conduct. Negroes, Orientals, Jews, and many other racial groups are treated as inferiors and subjected to numerous discrimination by many Nordic Christians in this country. The race problem is not a sectional one but usually varies in acuteness in proportion to the number of a given racial minority.

Throughout the South the inferiority of the Negro is regarded as axiomatic, although much kindness and benevolence is shown toward him as long as he will "stay in his place." But all talk of political and social equality is severely frowned upon. The extreme attitude toward black peoples is presented in the following extracts from a book written by a Vanderbilt University man, who, after spending three years in graduate study at the University of Chicago, travelled for six years in Africa, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and South America, and published in 1923 by the White American Society:

"The white race has founded all civilizations. . . . The Negro has not had, and cannot have, a part in progressive civilization. . . . That the coloured races do not originate is the most solemn fact of human history, the only fact that bodes ill for the future. . . . A race devoid of creative genius is an unfit type so far as progress in civilization is concerned. . . . Civilization has never survived intimate and prolonged contact with coloured races. . . . If we do remove the Negro, our civilization is to increase, and our

future belongs to God. . . . The white man is the sun that lights the world; the lustre of other races is but reflected glory. The white man is in fact what the negrophilist is in theory—the voice of the Almighty upon earth.”¹⁶

The position of the Ku Klux Klan on this question has been stated by H. W. Evans, the Imperial Wizard, in these words: “The Negro is not a menace to Americanism in the sense that the Jew or Roman Catholic is a menace. He is not actually hostile to it. He is simply racially incapable of understanding, sharing in, or contributing to Americanism.”¹⁷

Discrimination against Negroes is widely prevalent throughout the country. In the South segregation is carried to an extreme in separate schools, churches, railway coaches, residential districts, etc. As the number of Negroes in northern communities increase there is a marked tendency toward segregation. Negroes moving into white communities are often subjected to insult, persecution, and occasional violence.¹⁸ White Christians and black Christians are not permitted to worship together in many sections of the South. Even when they meet in the same building the Negroes are as a rule segregated by themselves, usually in the gallery. Negro delegates to national religious conventions have often been refused accommodations with white delegates in

¹⁶ Ernest Sevier Cox, *White American*, pp. 23, 27, 237, 245, 299, 300, 376.

¹⁷ *The Klan of Tomorrow*, p. 14.

¹⁸ For numerous illustrations of discrimination—civic, educational, economic, and social—see *Black America*, by Scott Nearing; and *And Who Is My Neighbor?* published by the *Inquiry*, 129 East 52d Street, New York City.

hotels and restaurants. On at least one occasion Negro bishops were not permitted to eat with their white colleagues. No white man can fully comprehend the degree of suffering borne by a sensitive Negro, subjected as he is in every realm of life to handicaps and insults.

Violence between Negroes and whites is of frequent occurrence. Numerous cases of atrocious assaults on white women by Negro men are on record. On the other hand, assaults on Negro women by white men are probably even more numerous. Moreover, the treatment accorded Negro criminals has frequently been extremely barbarous and inhuman. Lynching and mob violence in this country constitute a national disgrace.¹⁹ From 1885 to 1925 a total of 4,200 persons were lynched in the United States, of whom 3,182 were Negroes. This is an average of two per week for 41 years! Fortunately, the number of lynchings has declined rapidly in recent years. In 1928 the number was only eleven. Only eleven!

The degree of ferocity manifested by white lynching mobs can be surpassed only by searching the annals of savagery. Persons who under normal circumstances are law-abiding and even tender-hearted citizens exhibit maniacal fury when under the sway of mob passion. Incredible scenes are described by eyewitnesses of lynching bees and race riots. Some years ago Mr. Ray Stannard Baker

¹⁹ See *Black America*, section 19; also *The Law vs. the Mob*, a leaflet issued by the Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22d St., New York City; also *Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States*, published by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City.

made a study of several communities in which lynchings had occurred. Concerning the burning of two Negroes, who had killed a white man, assaulted and killed his wife, and burned three children to death, in Statesboro, Georgia, Mr. Baker wrote:

“Men were sent into town for kerosene oil and chains, and finally the Negroes were bound to an old stump, fagots were heaped around them, and each was drenched with oil. Then the crowd stood back accommodately, while a photographer, standing there in the bright sunshine, took pictures of the chained Negroes. Citizens crowded up behind the stump and got their faces into the photograph. When the fagots were lighted, the crowd yelled wildly. . . . And when it was all over, they began, in common with all mobs, to fight for souvenirs.”²⁰

A member of a mob at Huntsville, Alabama, cut off the little fingers of a Negro victim as souvenirs.

Near Waco, Texas, a young Negro man assaulted and murdered a white woman. He was captured and burned to death in the presence of nearly ten thousand people. An eyewitness describes the scene:

“The mob ripped the boy’s clothes off. . . . Someone cut his ear off; someone else unsexed him. . . . He was lowered into the fire several times by means of a chain around his neck. . . . About a quarter past one a fiend got the torso, lassoed it, hung a rope over the pommel of a saddle, and dragged it around through the streets of Waco.”²¹

²⁰ *What Is a Lynching?* in *McClure’s Magazine*, January, 1905, pp. 299-314.

²¹ Supplement to the *Crisis*, July, 1916.

An Associated Press dispatch on May 5, 1927, described a lynching in Little Rock in these words:

"The mob, together with posses of officers, pursued Carter into a forest and captured him. The mob, numbering several hundred persons, then took charge of the Negro, hanged him from a telephone pole, riddled the body with bullets, cut it down and tied it behind an automobile, which dragged it through the principal business thoroughfares. It was later saturated with gasoline and burned in a street bordering on the Negro section."

Lynching and mob violence are not confined to the South but occur in all sections of the country. Among the most flagrant cases on record are the riots in East St. Louis, Chicago, Omaha, and Washington. In July, 1919, a race war broke out in East St. Louis, a city in Illinois just across the river from St. Louis. The following account of events is taken from *Current Opinion*:

"Then hell broke loose. For the greater part of thirty-six hours, Negroes were hunted through the streets like wild animals. A black skin became a death warrant. Man after man, with hands upraised, pleading for his life, was surrounded by groups of men who had never seen him before and who knew nothing about him except that he was black, and stoned to death. . . . An aged Negro, tottering from weakness, was seized and hanged to a pole. Three million dollars' worth of property was destroyed."

A writer in the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* said: "I do not believe that Moslem fanaticism or Prussian frightfulness could perpetrate murders of more

deliberate brutality than those which I saw committed, in daylight, by citizens of the State of Abraham Lincoln."²²

The casualties of the Chicago race riots of 1919 were: 38 persons killed, 537 injured, and 1,000 rendered homeless. For four days anarchy and violence prevailed throughout large sections of the city.²³ In describing the situation, Professor Graham Taylor wrote:

"Armed men of either colour dashed through the district in automobiles and beyond, firing as they flew. Two white men, wounded while shooting up the district, were found to carry official badges, one being thus identified as in the United States civil service and the other as a Chicago policeman. White men firing a machine gun from a truck were killed. White and Negro policeman were in turn attacked and badly beaten by mobs of the opposite colour. The torch followed attacks upon Negro stores and dwellings, scores of which were set on fire. . . . A coloured soldier wearing a wound stripe on his sleeve was beaten to death while limping along one of the main streets."²⁴

Some years ago a group of one hundred prominent citizens, including ex-President Taft, Elihu Root, Charles W. Eliot, and Charles E. Hughes, signed an "Address to the Nation" on mob violence, in which they said: "Rarely are the members of a mob sought out and prosecuted even when they have participated in murder, undisguised and in full daylight, and only

²² *Current Opinion*, August, 1917, p. 76.

²³ See *The Negro in Chicago*, pp. 1-52.

²⁴ *The Survey*, August 9, 1919, p. 696.

in few isolated cases has any lyncher ever been punished.”²⁵ In a public meeting in New York City ex-President Roosevelt denounced mob violence as an “appalling outbreak of savagery.”

There is no doubt that a dangerous tension exists in many communities between whites and blacks. As Negroes become better educated they become more sensitive and resentful against being treated as inferiors. They are certainly becoming more race conscious and are acting with more solidarity. They now have four hundred publications devoted to their interest. Nearly eight thousand coloured college graduates are giving leadership to their various movements. “No sane observer,” says Alain Locke, in *The New Negro*, that truly remarkable anthology of Negro achievements, “however sympathetic to the new trend, would contend that the great masses are articulate as yet, but they stir, they move, they are more than physically restless. . . . Only the steadying and sobering effect of a truly characteristic gentleness of spirit prevents the rapid rise of a definite cynicism and counter-hate and a defiant superiority feeling. . . . Whether it actually brings into being new Armadas of conflict or argosies of cultural exchange and enlightenment can only be decided by the attitude of the dominant races in an era of critical change.”²⁶

The situation is made even more dangerous by reason of the fact that as Negroes become more aggressive in demanding justice, many white people

²⁵ *The Survey*, August 2, 1919, p. 675.

²⁶ Pp. 7, 13, 14.

become more alarmed and more determined to keep them "in their places." Since the migration northward has now reached huge proportions, the problem has become a truly national one.

It would obviously be unfair to blame white Christians for all the injustice and cruelty inflicted upon Negroes. But in two ways they are responsible for much of the misery endured by black people: first, many white Christians hold the extreme attitude toward the inferiority of Negroes and support discriminatory measures; and, second, by silence, evasion, and neglect they permit unjust measures to be perpetuated. The membership of the Ku Klux Klan includes a large portion of Protestant church members, and many of the officers and organizers are Protestant ministers. "The idealism of the Klan," says Imperial Wizard Evans, "is contained, in its entirety, in the teaching of Jesus. Of this idealism it may be said that Christ is all and in all. . . . On bended knee, 'neath the uplifted Fiery Cross, every Klansman is consecrated and admonished to consecrate himself. All his Klavern training is in the light of the Cross. And if he acquires the Klan Vision, his daily walk will be in the light of the Cross."²⁷

Fortunately, the Klan is losing ground rapidly. Influential groups of Southern Christians are successfully combating intolerance and are pleading for better understanding and more equitable relations between the races. *The interracial committees deserve praise and gratitude for the vigour and effectiveness of*

²⁷ *The Klan of Tomorrow*, by H. W. Evans, pp. 26, 27.

*their activities.*²⁸ But after all these gains have been taken into account the relations between the races in the United States are still appallingly bad. In the South the Negroes are victimized in a thousand ways; on the Pacific Coast the Orientals are subjected to numerous discriminations and insults; everywhere Jews and the newer immigrants are treated with scorn and contempt. The great majority of native-born white Protestants in the United States have failed to follow the example of Jesus in treating members of all races as kinsmen and members of a common household.

4. ECONOMIC INJUSTICE AND STRIFE

Many of the worst iniquities of modern times are found in the realm of industry. We must, therefore, now examine the prevailing system of producing and distributing the material goods and physical services necessary to abundant life. There are three ways of evaluating any institution. In the first place, it may be compared or contrasted with an earlier stage or a previous practice. By this test slavery, for example, represented progress. It was certainly more humane to enslave captives than to kill them. A second method was to compare the lot of the slaves in America with the condition of savages in the jungles or that of the slum dwellers of New York or London. Many slave owners settled back comfortably and

²⁸ Full information concerning the work of the interracial committee may be secured from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, 105 East 22d St., New York City.

complacently because they were convinced that the slaves were better off than the natives of Africa or the free wage earners of urban communities. A third test, however, was applied to slavery when it was examined in the light of an ideal. The abolitionists maintained that even if it be admitted that enslavement was preferable to slaughter and that the inhabitants of other regions were more afflicted, nevertheless, slavery was wrong and ought to be abolished.

The present economic order may similarly be evaluated. The first and second methods lead to an optimistic conclusion. *The people of the United States are incomparably better off in terms of material comforts than were the people of any previous generation or are the citizens of other countries at the present time.*²⁹ Judged by past ages or compared with the living conditions now prevalent in Asia or Europe, we have abundant reason to be enthusiastic over the existing industrial system. The result is that complacency is widespread throughout the land. The purpose of this section, however, is to apply the third test to capitalism. How does it appear when examined in the light of the religion of Jesus?

Self-interest, competition, and profits are the corner stones of the present economic order.³⁰ Ever since the early days of the industrial revolution it has been generally assumed that the most effective way for society to get the required goods produced

²⁹ See *This Economic World*, by Thos. N. Carver and Hugh W. Lester.

³⁰ See *Our Economic Morality and the Ethic of Jesus*, by Harry F. Ward, for an illuminating analysis of the present social order.

and the necessary services rendered is to permit every man to follow his own self-interest. It has also been assumed that individuals would recognize the wisdom of putting limits to their own greed, and that, therefore, enlightened self-interest would lead to the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Competition has long been exalted as the most efficient basis of production and distribution. Monopoly has been regarded as socially perilous, and strenuous efforts have been put forth to maintain free competition.

Profits differ in nature from wages and salaries. This is the way the system operates: a man invests his savings or borrowed capital in a given enterprise, and then purchases raw materials, pays wages and salaries to his employees, defrays all other operating expenses, pays interest and sets aside certain sums for depreciation—the amount left after all these items are deducted from the total income derived from the business being his profit. Thus employers are arrayed against employers, and as a class they are pitted against the workers on the one hand and against the consumers on the other; while the workers struggle with each other and also with employers and consumers. The prevailing industrial system, based upon the competitive struggle for personal gain, has produced four conspicuously distressing results.

1. It has led to vast disparity in privilege between the most successful and the least fortunate members of society. The relatively few at the top possess far more of this world's goods than they can use, while at the bottom are multitudes who fail to secure an

adequate supply even of the necessities of life. The poor are not getting poorer but the rich are getting richer at such a rapid pace that the chasm between the two groups is becoming wider. This state of affairs cannot be reconciled with the religion of Jesus. When the Family of God on earth becomes a reality the strong and successful kinsmen will share more equitably with the weak and unfortunate members of the household. Extreme luxury for some while many dwell in poverty is a denial of the family spirit.

There are now 24,000 millionaires in the United States, according to an estimate made by Mr. Carl Snyder of the Federal Reserve Board. Another estimate places the number at 14,000. In 1925 the number of persons reporting an income in excess of \$1,000,000 was 9,560. The families in the privileged group have vastly more comforts and luxuries than they need.

An examination of income tax returns reveals the fact, however, that the number of persons in the higher brackets is exceedingly small. The latest returns available in the 1928 issue of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* are for the year 1925. In that year all single persons with an annual income of \$1,500 and all married who received \$2,500 were required to file returns. And although the 1920 census places the number of persons gainfully employed in excess of 41 millions, only 4,171,051 persons filed any income tax return whatever in 1925. When we recall that in 1920 there were in this country nearly 30 million male workers over 20 years of age, these figures become even more startling. Of these 30 million men

only 830,670—less than one out of 36—reported an income as high as \$5,000 in 1925, and only 327,018 over \$10,000.³¹

The reasons for these low returns are revealed when wage and salary schedules are examined. Those citizens who grow ecstatic over the prevailing prosperity in the United States should be compelled to read and digest the contents of the two publications recently issued by the National Industrial Conference Board.³² In order to grasp the significance of these studies it must be remembered that they were prepared by a research organization which is sponsored by a large group of manufacturers and therefore should not be regarded as “radical” or “subversive.” One of them deals with the cost of living in twelve industrial cities, the other with wages in eight states.

The average annual cost of maintaining a fair American standard of living for husband, wife, and two children under fourteen, not three as in some former budgets, was estimated from \$1,441.96 to \$1,659.84. In only three cities was the figure under \$1,500, while the average for the twelve was \$1,556.32. Any reader will readily believe that these are minimum figures when he tries to imagine how he could maintain a family of four on these amounts.

Skilled and semi-skilled workers, when regularly employed, receive more than enough to meet these minimum budgets, although the margin is not as

³¹ *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1928, p. 180.

³² *The Economic Status of the Wage Earner in New York and Other States*; and *The Cost of Living in Twelve Industrial Cities*.

great as is commonly supposed. Sixty per cent. of milling machine operators in six of the eight states, for example, received less than \$1,511 if they lost no time whatever. But it is among common labourers that the rates are appallingly low. The average for men in the eight states was as follows: over 63 per cent. received less than \$1,053 if they worked regularly throughout the year; while less than 3 per cent. received more than \$1,282. More than 21 per cent. of the women received less than \$595, while 82 per cent. received less than \$824 for a whole year's work. All of the above rates are calculated at eight hours per day, with Saturday afternoon off, fifty-two weeks per year. Enforced unemployment must be taken into account when calculating the adequacy of wages.

The average hourly earnings for all employees in the cotton manufacturing industry of the United States in 1928 were 32.4 cents, and the average full-time earnings per week amounted to \$17.30. This astounding fact was taken from a recent report made by the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics after an investigation of the wages of 49,861 males and 38,145 females in 158 representative cotton mills in eleven states. If a worker is employed steadily throughout the year at the average rate his annual earnings are just a few cents less than \$900. A considerable percentage necessarily falls far short of the average. If we examine the wages of men and women separately, we find that the average annual earnings for men varied from \$758.16 in the state with the lowest rates to \$1,275.04 in the highest state. Average

annual earnings for women ran from \$617.76 to \$1,056.12.

According to an estimate by President Kenyon L. Butterfield, "between 1910 and 1925 the amount of mortgage debts on owner-operated farms increased from \$1,726,000,000 to \$4,517,000,000; and the ratio of debt to value from 27.3 per cent. to 41.9 per cent. The total debt of American farmers to-day, both mortgage and personal, is probably between \$11,000,000,000 and \$12,000,000,000. The farmer, moreover, has had for several years to pay interest and principal with an income that has had a purchasing power of about 80, compared with 1910-14. In 1924-25 it took 30 per cent. of the cash income of owner-operators to pay interest on their debts."

An extraordinarily significant summary of average earnings in the United States for 1928 has recently been released by the National Bureau of Economic Research, an authoritative scientific body, which numbers among its directors Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Company; George E. Roberts of the American Bankers Association; Professors John R. Commons, Allyn Y. Young, Edwin F. Gay, and L. C. Marshall. This special study was prepared by Professor Willford I. King, whose previous researches in this field have earned for him an enviable reputation as a highly qualified and trustworthy statistician.

The "average earnings per wage worker for those constantly on the pay roll in three industries" in 1928 were estimated as follows: factory operatives, \$1,240; railway trainmen, \$2,404; other railway wage workers, \$1,315; agricultural labourers, \$636. In terms of

"dollars having purchasing power equal to that of 1913," the average earnings for 1928 were: factory operatives, \$733; railway trainmen, \$1,414; other railway wage workers, \$774; agricultural labourers, \$456. On a comparative basis these earnings represent a substantial gain during the past two decades. Nevertheless, the evidence is cumulative and inescapable that vast numbers of workers in this favoured land are unable to support a family in decency and reasonable comfort.

Half of all the heads of families in the United States earn less than \$1,500 per year, while many millions fall below \$1,200 annually. In many of these households severe privation is avoided by supplementary income derived from the labour of other members of the family, multitudes of women and children having been driven into shops and factories. But in several million American homes the total annual income is utterly inadequate to provide the necessities and decencies of life. The result is malnutrition and disease from lack of proper food; wretched housing conditions with the consequent lack of privacy and attractiveness, leading to immorality and domestic discord; mental and cultural destitution; inadequate recreational facilities; and the increase of crime as a result of all these factors. And yet we find in the same communities a small percentage of persons who live in extreme luxury, gratifying every physical desire, spending enough on some new toy to remove a neighbouring family from desolation, and wasting on superfluities sufficient to provide the physical basis for the good life in a hundred house-

holds. Many Christians see no contradiction between their own luxurious living and the example of their Lord.

Early in 1929, in a letter addressed to the editor of *The Western Mail and South Wales News*, of Cardiff, Wales, James J. Davis, United States Secretary of Labor, said: "Here and there has been for many years in Europe, and especially since the Great War, an impression that all Americans are wealthy and that poverty among us is conspicuous only through its absence. I wish, indeed, that the popular European impression were a true one, but no foreign impression of us has ever been more false. . . . I admit that the American worker is better off than the worker of any other country in the world. But the American worker is not dwelling in Utopia. No country can be considered Utopian when 86% of its people are poor."³³

2. The prevailing economic system leads to the concentration of almost illimitable power in the hands of the few. In an industrial civilization money is power, power over life and destiny. Under the high degree of specialization necessitated by mass production, the worker no longer produces his own food or makes his own clothing. He must buy the necessary goods and services, and this requires money. Since he does not, as a rule, own his tools, he must seek employment in a factory or mine. Hence his livelihood is dependent upon a job over which he has only the most feeble control.

³³Quoted in *The Literary Digest*, February 16, 1919.

The modern corporation is an effective device for concentrating the control of business and industry. This fact is frequently overlooked by persons who call attention to the decentralization in ownership of our corporations. Some of the largest corporations have more than 450,000 stockholders. In theory, corporations are controlled by the stockholders, but in fact they are controlled by small boards of directors. Only a negligible percentage of the stockholders ever votes or participates in any way in the determination of the policies of the company. The annual meetings of even the largest concerns are rarely attended by more than a hundred persons. The dozen men who act as directors of the United States Steel Corporation, for example, not only control their own funds, but also control the policies of this two-billion-dollar company. The rapid growth of the practice of selling stock to employees is a step in the right direction, but its significance has been greatly overemphasized. As a matter of fact, the total stock owned by all employees in this country is less than three per cent. of the outstanding stock of the various companies in which they have invested.

Corporations are becoming more and more gigantic in size. We now have a dozen concerns with assets of a billion dollars each and many others that mount into the hundred-million-dollar class. The tendency all along the line is in the direction of concentration. Chain stores are dominating the field of retail distribution and are gaining ground rapidly. Distribution is being Fordized. The small producer and the

small distributor alike are being engulfed by the onward sweep of consolidation.

By means of interlocking directorates the same group of men are able to control many corporations. Some of the most powerful individuals are directors of more than one hundred different companies. A few years ago the fact was brought out in an official inquiry that a group of twelve men was represented in the control of corporations having assets of more than ten billions.

Employers' Associations are increasing in number and influence. There are now more than two thousand such organizations throughout the country. Out of their conferences are coming numerous agreements. The more powerful financiers and industrialists dominate these trade groups.

Banks are playing an increasingly important rôle in our industrial, commercial, and agricultural life. The capital funds of our state and national banks exceed seven billion dollars, while the total resources exceed sixty-eight billions. Four of the largest banks in the country each have total resources of about a billion dollars. The persons who control the policies of these banks exercise a simply incalculable influence. Banks everywhere are consolidating, and the control is passing into fewer and fewer hands. One New York bank represents the merger of 38 financial institutions. There are 524 fewer banks in the United States now than there were eight years ago. Some time ago, when consolidation had not proceeded so far as it now has, it was discovered in an official

inquiry that 6 large banks controlled corporations employing 785,499 workers. Twelve New York banks hold 267 directorates in 92 of the leading railroads of the country.

The trend toward concentration of control of industry and finance in this country is unmistakable. A recent writer in the conservative *Washington Post* said: "A single group of not more than 20,000 business men is in charge of American prosperity to-day. These men are directors and officers of dominant corporations in many lines of industry. They manage the affairs of about 1,200 out of more than 400,000 corporations doing business in America at the present time. The stockholders of those 1,200 corporations will receive in dividends half of the net profits of American business, incorporated, in 1926." These 1,200 corporations are owned by 3,000,000 stockholders but are controlled by 12,000 directors and 8,000 active chief officers.

These 20,000 bankers and business men—or, even if we multiply the figure by ten, the total will still represent an infinitesimal fraction of the population of the United States—not only dominate industry, commerce, and finance, they exercise enormous influence in the determination of our social and political policies. One has only to stay in Washington or any state capital for a short time to discover their power. To be successful in politics is an expensive undertaking, and few poor men rise to high office unless they are backed by men of wealth or moneyed interests, although there are, of course, notable exceptions. The big business interests have been more

completely in control of the government at Washington during the past eight years than at any time in our history.

The press of the country is dominated by rich men. An increasing amount of capital is required to operate newspapers and magazines. The initial investment necessary for the founding of a great daily paper runs into millions. Men of wealth also exercise control over education to a degree wholly out of proportion to their number. All along the line their power is felt—in local schools, colleges, universities, and graduate institutions. In churches and other religious organizations their influence is very great. Controlling the means of forming public opinion to the extent that they do, it is not surprising that they are becoming increasingly powerful and more and more deeply intrenched.

Can benevolent autocrats be trusted to do the right thing for the groups dependent upon them? Yes and no. Kind-hearted kings are among the world's benefactors. Men of great wealth and power have frequently rendered conspicuous public service. But can you rely on the benevolence of autocrats? No, for many reasons. Among the wielders of arbitrary power are some individuals of selfish and callous dispositions. Moreover, even the kindest of autocrats may be—and frequently is—blind. History is filled with illustrations of the inability of good people to realize the consequences of their attitudes and practices. For centuries men of great compassion and deep piety owned human beings as chattels and defended the institution of slavery as being of divine origin.

Ecclesiastics, with clear consciences, long used instruments of torture in dealing with unbelievers. Cotton Mather interrupted his long periods of prayer to participate in the persecution of witches. Autocrats may be cruel; they are quite likely to be blind.

Especially is it true that men cannot be trusted with arbitrary power when their own interests are at stake. Many of the British employers who formerly worked little children for twelve and fourteen hours per day in dangerous and unsanitary factories were pillars of the church. These same highly respected citizens caused women and girls to engage in heavy labour in the coal mines along with debauched and half-nude men. Conscientious but blind employers have always been among the most bitter opponents of reform measures.

A recent illustration of the menace of arbitrary power is found in the attitudes and practices of Judge E. H. Gary, chairman of the United States Steel Corporation. After a long interview with this most powerful of American industrialists several years ago, I became convinced as to his sincerity, kindness—and blindness. For many years he resisted all efforts to change the inhuman twelve-hour day and seven-day week, with the twenty-four-hour shift every two weeks, on the twofold ground that the shorter day would increase the cost of production to such an extent as to be impracticable; and, second, that the workers really wanted the twelve-hour day. Conscientious employers in this country have frequently, if not usually, resisted legislation designed to reduce accidents and protect health, workers'

compensation acts, measures safeguarding women in industry, and even the abolition of child labour. Every reform measure has met with vigorous opposition from well-intentioned but defective-visioned men of wealth.

No, society cannot afford to leave itself to the mercy of autocrats, vicious or benevolent. Especially is it true that we Americans cannot afford to sit idly by while men of wealth gather unto themselves greater and greater power over our social policies. Financial dictatorships, like their political counterparts, destroy real freedom and lead sooner or later to hostility and warfare. For our children's sake, as well as for our own, we must do something about the menace of concentrated control. For, it should be remembered, if present tendencies are allowed to go unchecked for another quarter or half century the degree of power concentrated in a few hands will be utterly unparalleled in human history.

"After more than three centuries," says Dr. John A. Ryan, "there approaches a return to feudalism. In the Middle Ages, feudalism was based upon military force and the ownership of land. The new feudalism is political and industrial. Not improbably it will be more or less benevolent. The masses will probably enjoy a slightly higher degree of economic welfare than has ever been within their reach before. But they will enjoy it at the expense of genuine freedom. They will have surrendered the right to determine their own economic lives."

If political autocracy is a denial of the family spirit, even though an occasional king or czar is

wise and benevolent, financial and industrial autocracy likewise stands condemned, in spite of generous philanthropies and other benefactions. Society cannot afford to permit individuals and small groups to wield vast irresponsible power over the other members of the community. Representative government is as sorely needed in industry as in affairs of state. For society to delegate temporary power to a president, for example, is an utterly different procedure from accepting the irresponsible lordship of an hereditary ruler. Mass production in industry is not necessarily a violation of the family spirit and undoubtedly requires centralization of direction. For workers, consumers, and investors coöperatively to delegate temporary control of huge industries to responsible officials is, however, very different from permitting individuals to secure vast private fortunes—by genius, thrift, control of natural resources, the rise of land values, the capitalization of the earning power of corporations, speculation or gambling—and thereby exercise irresponsible power over their fellows. When the Family of God is achieved none of the members of the household will wield autocratic power over their brethren.

3. Bitterness and strife are inherent in a system that rests upon self-interest, competition, and profits. Rivalry in games and artistic pursuits is not the same thing as competition for material possessions and social power. The latter releases primitive emotions and leads to conflict. Modern industrial communities are more of a battle field than they are a brotherhood. The competition between different

concerns is terrific and results in countless tragedies. The number of commercial failures in this country averages twenty-five thousand per year, and several times this total narrowly escape bankruptcy. The strain and stress of this struggle is devastating to personality and calamitous to human relations.

The struggle between employers and workers is often even more relentless. Industrial communities are frequently smouldering volcanoes. Even during periods of so-called industrial peace, spies and private armed forces are often employed. At frequent intervals destructive eruptions occur. Now and then violence breaks out and pitched battles occur. The volume entitled *Civil War in West Virginia* does not refer to the unpleasantness of the '60's but describes the industrial warfare intermittently waged in that state. Even if there is little class consciousness among workers in this country, nevertheless class consciousness among employers is steadily becoming more acute and will eventually provoke the former into concerted action. In these countries where industrialism is most advanced violent conflict seems to be more virulent. Many competent observers are convinced that during the next fifty years the social perils inherent in class war are even more ominous than are likely to arise as the result of another world war.³⁴

4. Another serious indictment of the present economic order is that it stimulates excessively the desire for things. Many Christians are now paying too

³⁴See Ward, *op. cit.*, pp. 286-323.

heavy a price for success. In a civilization where to an unparalleled degree money represents power and privilege, the temptation to put gold above all other values is terrific. Countless thousands of present-day Christians are wearing themselves out in the frantic struggle "to keep up with the Joneses." Many a man devotes himself so exclusively to business that he exhausts himself physically, mentally, socially, and spiritually. There is no mystery as to the causes of the rapid increase in fatalities from heart diseases and nervous ailments. As economic and financial competition becomes keener the price of success grows more devastating.

The desire for things is insatiable and therefore more and more money is demanded. Where an income of \$5,000 once seemed ample, now \$10,000 is absolutely necessary. Do we not hear of the poor rich man with a mere \$100,000 when his minimum needs run to twice that amount? Where success is measured in terms of things, the gambling spirit is likely to prevail. Never before in American life have so many persons acquired the gambling habit. The speculation mania has increased business on the stock market to such an extent that the New York Stock Exchange has created 275 additional seats. A new ticker has been installed, geared to handle transactions of between seven million and nine million shares a day, as compared with the *monthly* average of twelve million shares for the five years preceding the World War. So prosperous is the speculative game that a seat on the Exchange recently sold for \$625,000, although some of the present members bought their

seats for \$3,000 to \$7,000. In a small Pennsylvania city recently I was told that at least five hundred persons in that community are playing the stock market. Gambling Christians are not likely to be noted for their spirituality.

A materialistic society soon becomes jaded and constantly seeks new thrills. The history of mankind seems to make it clear that luxurious communities tend to over-emphasize sex and to indulge in all manner of excesses. Herein is found a partial explanation of the reason why there are so many divorces and other domestic tragedies. Happy homes cannot be built upon the pursuit of things and thrills. That multitudes of present-day Christians are spending their lives in struggling for luxuries and thrills will not be denied by anyone who has had wide opportunities of observation. To an appalling degree, "things are in the saddle" and are riding whole communities to physical exhaustion, mental distraction, and spiritual impoverishment.

Complacency is possible only to those persons who test modern industry in the United States by comparing it with a previous stage or with conditions in some other region. No one with clear insight and sensitive conscience will attempt to reconcile the prevailing hatreds and cruelties with the ideal society envisaged by Jesus. Every time we pray, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth," we are pleading for drastic changes in the existing economic order. When the Family of God is created it will bear little resemblance to the present industrial and financial system.

5. ECCLESIASTICISM AND DENOMINATIONALISM

Another striking contrast between Jesus and Christianity is found in the excessive emphasis upon theological beliefs by contemporary churchmen and the comparative neglect of social ethics. While there is plenty of evidence to prove that conditions in these respects are not as disgraceful as in some periods of the past, and while there is reason to expect substantial improvements in the near future, the present record of the churches in this connection is exceedingly distressing.

Let us first examine certain sections of some of the creeds which are still accepted as binding by the various communions. The Westminster Confession proclaims the doctrine of predestination and foreordination in these words: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." This same creed outlines the doctrine of original sin. Because "our first parents, being seduced by the subtilty and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit," and thereby becoming corrupt, "the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descended from them by ordinary generation."

The Augsburg Confession says that baptism "is

necessary to salvation," for children as well as for adults, and condemns the Anabaptists because they "affirm that children are saved without Baptism." That Christ descended into hell is asserted in the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Thirty-nine Articles, and other creeds. In many of the creeds it is specifically stated that Christians may "act as soldiers" and "wage war upon just and necessary occasion." But it may be argued that these creeds are centuries old and are not accepted as authoritative to-day. Let us therefore look at some recent ecclesiastical pronouncements and endeavour to discover prevailing attitudes on theological questions.

In 1923 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America reaffirmed the famous "Five Points" which had been adopted in 1910. The five "essential doctrines of the Word of God and our standards" are these:

1. That the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of the Holy Scripture as *to keep them from error*.³⁵

2. That our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.

3. That Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice *to satisfy divine justice* and to reconcile us to God.

4. That on the third day He rose again from the dead *with the same body* with which He suffered, with which also He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession.

5. That Our Lord Jesus showed His power and

³⁵All italics in this section are mine.

love by working mighty miracles. This working was not contrary to nature, but superior to it.³⁶

In 1924 the Baptist Bible Union adopted a statement or creed with nine points, from which the following sentences are taken:

"We believe that the Bible was written by men supernaturally inspired; that it has truth *without any admixture of error* for its matter; that, as originally written, it is *both scientifically and historically true and correct*. . . . That the Genesis account is to be accepted *literally*, and not allegorically or figuratively. . . . That man's creation was not a matter of evolution or evolutionary change of species, or development through interminable periods of time from lower to higher forms. . . . That Jesus Christ was begotten of the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner; born of Mary, a virgin, as no other man was ever born or can be born of woman, and that He is both the Son of God, and God, the Son. . . . That the salvation of sinners is *wholly* of grace; through the mediatorial offices of the Son of God. . . . That His atonement consisted not in setting us an example by His death as a martyr, but was the voluntary substitution of Himself in the sinner's place. . . . That in order to be saved, sinners must be born again; that the new birth is a new creation in Christ Jesus; that it is instantaneous and *not a process*. . . . That the new creation is brought about in a manner above our comprehension, not by culture, not by character, nor by the will of man. . . . That Christian Baptism is the immersion in water. . . . That it is pre-requisitive of a church relation. . . . We believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ. . . . And that He will

³⁶Quoted by E. C. Vanderlaan, *Fundamentalism and Modernism*, p. 2.

return 'in like manner' literally, personally and bodily, back to the earth."³⁷

The significant point to keep in mind is not merely that millions of Christians hold these beliefs but that many ecclesiastical authorities insist that one is not a true Christian and cannot be saved if he rejects these beliefs. The situation has improved greatly during the past quarter-century, but the ideas which prevailed during my boyhood are still widely prevalent. When I united with the church at the age of thirteen I was taught that it was sinful to use a piano, organ, or violin in church, that immersion was essential to salvation, and that no other persons would be saved except the members of that particular branch of the church. I remember pleading earnestly with a chum to join my church—by a strange irony he was a Baptist—so that he would not be thrust into the fires of hell. The number of Christians who hold the doctrine of exclusive salvation through their denomination has greatly diminished but still embraces many millions.

In many sections of the country and in many communions it is impossible for a candidate for the ministry to receive ordination if he admits doubts as to the inerrancy of the Bible, the Virgin Birth, the bodily resurrection, and other orthodox doctrines. Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, one of the foremost Fundamentalists, in the course of a plea to exclude those who deny the orthodox faith, said: "But if they do not withdraw, and if they persist in their de-

³⁷ Quoted by Vanderlaan, *ibid.*, pp. 21-25.

fiance of the church, then, if the Presbyterian church is to endure, it must proceed against them. No church can endure half rationalistic and half evangelical. Nor can there be any true peace with these two parties in the same church. . . . Presbyterians . . . are ready to receive into the churches all those whom they believe Christ will receive into His Kingdom.”³⁸

Even more vigorous is a statement by Professor John Gresham Machen, of Princeton Theological Seminary: “Two mutually exclusive religions are being propagated within the Presbyterian church, as within other ‘evangelical’ churches. One is the great redemptive religion known as Christianity; the other is the naturalistic or agnostic modernism represented by Dr. Fosdick and by many Presbyterian ministers. If one of these is true the other is false. It is, therefore, quite intolerable that both of them should be propagated by the same funds with the endorsement of the same funds. . . . We would not indeed obscure the difference which divides us from Rome. The gulf is indeed profound. But profound as it is, it seems almost trifling compared to the abyss which stands between us and many ministers of our own church. The church of Rome may represent a perversion of the Christian religion; but naturalistic liberalism is not Christianity at all.”³⁹

The Reverend G. W. McPherson, in a pamphlet “strongly recommended by Rev. James Gray of the Moody Bible Institute, Rev. R. A. Torrey of the Los Angeles Bible Institute,” and other Fundamen-

³⁸ *Christian Work*, July 21, 1923, p. 88.

³⁹ Quoted by Vanderlaan, *ibid.*, pp. 361, 366.

talist leaders, makes a vigorous attack upon "the new theology" as taught at "Union Seminary, Harvard, Yale, University of Chicago, Colgate, Rochester, Newton, and Crozier," in the course of which he says: "Americans, I appeal to you, as you love your life, your children, your country, humanity, God, arise like true men and drive from your schools of learning and from your pulpits the new German theology. Pull it down and throw it out. It is a vile, lying intruder. Drive it back to Germany and to Hell from whence it came."⁴⁰

Belief transcends ethical conduct in importance if we are to judge by the relative emphasis of creeds and numerous ecclesiastical utterances. An examination of the three massive volumes, *The Creeds of Christendom*, edited by Professor Schaff, leaves one appalled at the disproportionate emphasis placed upon fine points of theology and the comparative neglect of social ethics. We find hundreds of pages about the Trinity, the Sacraments, and Ecclesiastical Orders but relatively few paragraphs about the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the value of personality, the duty of love and forgiveness, the overcoming of evil with good, the necessity of taking one's cross and following Christ.

Neither the famous "Five Points" of the Presbyterians nor the "Nine Points" of the Baptist Bible Union lay any emphasis upon the ethics of Jesus. Not love toward God and man but theological beliefs are made the test of loyalty to Christ. Throughout *Christendom* major emphasis has been and still is

⁴⁰*The New and Old Theology and the Cross*, pp. 11, 12.

placed upon orthodox faith rather than upon ethical conduct. During few if any periods for fifteen centuries have ecclesiastical leaders as a whole been alert to the great social iniquities of their time or devoted themselves to the abolition of the terrible injustices by which the mass of their fellows were victimized. Even to-day much more time and money are devoted to theological controversy and the perpetuation of denominational institutions than to the crusade against war, poverty, and race prejudice. Indeed, pioneers of the new social order frequently discover that their foes are those of their own religious household. Rapid progress is being made in the direction of supplanting theological controversy with religious experience and ethical endeavour, but an immense distance must yet be travelled before the goal is reached.

CHAPTER V

IS THE RELIGION OF JESUS PRACTICABLE?

HUNDREDS of millions of persons in many lands profess to believe in Jesus, but only a relatively few consistently follow his way of sacrificial good will. Most Christians have only a faint realization of the contrasts to which attention has been directed in the preceding chapters. And of those who do appreciate the fundamental differences between contemporary Christianity and Jesus' way of life, the great majority are convinced that under present conditions it would be folly to take Jesus seriously. A noble ideal, a beautiful dream, a wonderful theory, but utterly impractical under existing circumstances: this is the attitude of most Christians.

To profess belief in high ideals and yet refuse to follow them on the ground that they are impracticable may prove to be more perilous than never to have accepted them at all. Nothing is more paralyzing than the conclusion that one's ideals are unattainable or that one's teacher cannot be followed. And if a man escapes the impotence of despair, he is still confronted with the temptations of self-deception and hypocrisy. Many a person justifies mediocrity on the ground that his goal is too high to be reached. Too often profession of belief is substituted for the specific application of principles. An individual may feel

self-righteous because he has said, "Lord, Lord," and yet not do the things demanded by his ideals. Much talk about wonderful theories frequently constitutes a smoke screen behind which ignoble and sordid deeds are hidden. To praise honesty as a virtue while manipulating the stock market, to uphold the brotherhood of man as a noble aspiration while engaged in exploiting one's fellows, to extol love as the divinest of gifts while using weapons of violence—these are either self-deception or hypocrisy. To cease striving earnestly for the complete realization of one's ideals is fatal alike to spiritual growth and to social progress. The inoculation of society with a mild form of Christianity has frequently made it immune to the religion of Jesus.

One of the most tragic blunders of Christendom has been the placing of such extreme emphasis upon the uniqueness of Jesus that an unbridgeable gulf has been created between him and the rest of mankind. If all human beings are created in the spiritual image of God and if there is only one kind of personality, then the only difference between Jesus and other men is one of maturity. True enough, that difference is a stupendous one, for he climbed far higher than the rest of the family have been able to do. But his very purpose in living was to enable his brethren to scale the same heights. Again and again he challenged his disciples to follow him, to live as he lived and if need be to die as he died. He urges his followers to be perfect as the heavenly Father is perfect, and in John's Gospel he is quoted as saying that the disciples will be able to do greater things than he has done.

Either Jesus expected his teaching to be taken seriously under prevailing circumstances or he did not; either his religion is a way of transforming the present world into the divine society or it is only an elusive mirage. If the Sermon on the Mount is not meant to be followed here and now it is of little value to mankind. It is easy to show that some of the admonitions contained therein would be quite meaningless in a perfect world. How can a man be blessed because he is persecuted for righteousness' sake when there is no persecution? How is it possible to be a peacemaker when there is no war? How can one agree quickly with his adversary when there are no adversaries? Why tell a man not to resist evil when there is no evil? How can you love your enemy when there are no enemies? Why issue warning against saluting your brethren only when all are regarded as kinsmen? How can one pray as a hypocrite when there are no hypocrites? How can you forgive men their trespasses when no one does any wrong?

My own conviction is that the religion of Jesus is practicable if . . . but is not possible unless . . . It will prove to be effective if we fulfil the conditions which Jesus fulfilled; it will not work unless we are prepared to carry out the necessary requirements. The indispensable conditions seem to me to be these: that we make our good will intelligent; that we create adequate social organization through which the spirit of sacrificial love may find adequate expression; that we abandon the doctrine that the end justifies the means and replace it with the idea that only those weapons are permissible which are ap-

propriate in a home; that we are willing to run the risks and accept the consequences of living daily as good members of God's Family; and that we discover and utilize the resources of spiritual power which are available. To apply the religion of Jesus under existing circumstances is extremely difficult and highly dangerous and cannot be done without the wisdom and love and power that come from God.¹

I. IF OUR GOOD WILL IS INTELLIGENT

Over against the perilous assumption that the religion of Jesus is impracticable there is the dangerous generality that if we could only get men to accept Jesus all human problems would be solved. Much Christian preaching is nothing more than a vague appeal that individuals come to Jesus, with little instruction as to just what is meant or how he helps us. Social reformers, in their efforts to abolish exploitation and injustice, have often pleaded in vain for support from Christian people who were preoccupied with the salvation of souls. It is a dangerous delusion to assume that a person who makes a sincere confession of faith in Christ will thereafter lead an ethical life. An abundance of evidence has already been cited to show that devout and conscientious Christians frequently ignore completely the most appalling human needs at their very doors and sometimes engage in diabolical practices.

Acceptance of a general principle is of little avail unless it is intelligently applied in specific cases.

¹See *Does Civilization Need Religion?*, by Reinhold Niebuhr, an illuminating analysis of modern life.

Nothing is more pitiful than ignorant or misguided love. Many a mother with deep affection has nevertheless been the means of destroying her own child. Love may prove to be deadly unless it is informed. All Christians believe in brotherhood as an ideal but there are a thousand conflicting opinions as to what it means in concrete situations. Slave-owning ministers believed in brotherhood but usually failed to condemn the practice of holding human beings as chattels. Witch hunters believed in the value of personality but went right ahead and burned their victims at the stake. Wealthy churchmen accept the idea that a man is his brother's keeper but often continue to live luxuriously while multitudes of their fellows are in dire distress. Devout soldiers remember that Jesus' method is to overcome evil by doing good but nevertheless go on using bayonets and bombs and gas. General principles are not enough.

Before a given problem can be permanently solved understanding of its causes is necessary. Correct analysis is essential to the effective application of general principles. Take the question of crime, for example. One who approaches the question from the angle of Jesus' religion will constantly remember that every person is of inherent value, that there must be no desire for revenge, that evil must be overcome by doing good. In the light of these ideals just what should be done with a criminal? That all depends on what kind of a wrongdoer he is. Accidental, youthful, diseased, and professional criminals require different types of treatment. Frequently in a fit of passion a man commits a grave offense. Very

often a young boy who has been reared under unfavourable surroundings and who lacks training and discipline will thoughtlessly do violence to another. Many criminals are feeble-minded or victims of some emotional derangement; while some are so depraved that they live by crime and appear to be utterly heartless. What does the way of love require in dealing with these groups? Not inaction or indifference, certainly. Segregation from normal society at least temporarily is necessary. By all available devices as complete an analysis as possible should be made, after which the victim should be subjected to the kind of treatment required, whether it be physical, mental, disciplinary, environmental, moral, or spiritual. Cases would doubtless be discovered where prolonged or even permanent seclusion is required for the safety of others. Even with these cases, however, punishment should be avoided. If we were wise we would find out what is the matter with the criminal and then proceed to redeem him if at all possible. Solitary confinement is no cure for a man who is mentally unbalanced because of bone pressure on his brain. Exhortation cannot accomplish much with an imbecile. Fear of punishment is no deterrent for one who is emotionally distraught. If religious people would put their minds into the task of discovering the causes and cure of crime and seek earnestly for the means of its prevention, society could be more adequately safeguarded and wrongdoers more permanently restored to right relations with their fellows.

The impotence of unintelligent good will is illus-

trated also in the way Christians have usually dealt with the problem of war. It is a notorious fact that heretofore the churches have been unable to prevent war or secure an equitable or lasting peace. The chief reasons for this paralysis are as plain as the noonday sun. Most churchmen have only the vaguest idea why nations fight. The real significance of nationalism and imperialism has escaped them. All except a few blindly adhere to the theory of armed preparedness. The vast majority unthinkingly accept the interpretation of patriotism which demands unqualified obedience to the nation, even if it commands slaughter in the name of duty. The churches have too often accepted the immoral code of the state, instead of insisting that the nation follow the ethical principles of Jesus.

Religion can never be effective in international relations until its advocates realize the divisive nature of the dogmas of nationalism and seriously undertake their transformation; until they understand the significance of imperialistic rivalry between various powers for control of the resources of the earth; until they appreciate the peril of reliance upon armies and navies; until they devote themselves to the task of replacing international suspicion, fear, and enmity with sympathy, confidence, and friendliness. Religion will continue to be impotent in world affairs until a much greater volume of international understanding and intelligent good will have been created.

And so it is with poverty and strife in industry. Religion will not be able to abolish misery and en-

mity until its followers understand the nature of the present order.² Many will continue to live in want as long as society permits a relatively few to monopolize natural resources and by the concentration of financial power divert an unfair proportion of the proceeds of industry into the coffers of the wealthy. If some live in luxury from unearned increment as the result of increased land values, others will dwell in slums because rents are too high elsewhere. The anarchy that comes from production for profit instead of for use will continue to bring forth its harvest of enforced unemployment and resultant misery. An urban society that fails to see the necessity for a comprehensive scheme of social insurance will never abolish poverty.

Strife and enmity will prevail as long as selfishness and competition are enthroned. Christians too often vainly imagine that a society can glorify personal gain as the driving motive of production and exalt selfish competition as its method and yet be able to eliminate bitterness and hostility. If men are consciously or unconsciously taught that success should be measured in terms of material possessions and that as long as they observe the rules of the game they are entitled to all that they can grab, it is idle to expect brotherhood in industry. Religion will continue to be ineffective until its advocates understand the inherent contradiction between the competitive struggle for selfish gain and the religion of Jesus, and until they realize that when the Family of God

²*Our Economic Morality and the Ethic of Jesus*, by Harry F. Ward, is an invaluable treatment of this whole problem.

comes on earth the present economic order will have been radically transformed.

And this same observation needs to be made concerning every other aspect of the social problem. Without insight and understanding, good will is impotent. Much of the world's misery is due to the fact that Christians have so often failed to love God with all their *mind*. The neglect of the teaching function of the church is responsible for much of the prevailing distress. Only within the last two decades have theological seminary faculties made any serious effort to understand economic, political, and international questions, and even now only the barest beginning has been made. Religious education within the churches is still in a tragic plight, notwithstanding the substantial progress made during recent years. Christians with only a faint understanding of the teaching of Jesus and with abysmal ignorance concerning the world in which they live can never transform society. If the religion of Jesus is to prove effective good will must be intelligent.

2. IF WE CREATE ADEQUATE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Agreement is just as essential as understanding. People with good will cannot keep the peace unless they learn how to coöperate. A simple illustration will make this clear. Let us suppose that somewhere there is a community with a thousand families and that all members have only kindness and affection for each other. Then assume that each family has a new automobile and that there are no traffic regula-

tions whatever. One man decides that he will follow tradition and drive on the right; another that, since the scenery is more beautiful on the left, he will drive on that side; another that he will follow a long-established practice of avoiding extremes and stay right in the middle of the road; another that, in order to prevent monotony, he will zigzag back and forth from one side to the other; another that he will drive one mile on the right and the next mile on the left; another that he will get an extra thrill by driving backward; and still another that he will rotate, Sunday on the right, Monday on the left, Tuesday in the centre, Wednesday zigzag, and so on. No prophetic gift is required to foresee the outcome. Before the week ended there would be, even in a community of angels, profanity and bloodshed. Good will is not enough, understanding and agreement are essential.

If this is true in so simple a situation as the one described, how much more is it true with regard to the extraordinarily complex social problems confronting us. And yet Christian people have given tragically little attention to international and industrial organization. It seems almost incredible that the churches should have imagined that it was possible for nations to dwell together in peace without understanding and agreement. Upon what were the churches relying for the maintenance of peace in 1914? Their trust was in the Hague Tribunal, which, in spite of the fact that it marked an advance over old methods, was little more than a panel of names, from which prospective belligerents could select arbitrators if they were so inclined. Fortunately,

very genuine progress has been made during the past decade. The League of Nations, the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the International Labour Office have been created. But even now the nations are very reluctant to abandon the old diplomacy and make use of coöperative processes. And as for the United States, it has steadily refused to enter the League and the Labour Office and as yet is not a member of the Permanent Court because the other nations refused to grant it the privileged position demanded, although it now appears likely that this difficulty will soon be overcome. So little do the Christians of the United States appreciate the need for world organization that they are making only half-hearted efforts to induce their government to do its share in creating adequate international machinery. And still we wonder why religion is so ineffective in world affairs! Jesus' way of life will not be practicable for nations until the good will of peoples is intelligent and until adequate social organization is created, through which kindness and sympathy may be expressed. Traffic rules are required. Conciliation, arbitration, judicial decision, international conferences, and administrative agencies are all necessary to peace and friendship. A world system of red and green lights is essential to the efficient functioning of the family spirit.

Industry also needs adequate organization if religion is to be effective. Oligarchic control always leads to exploitation and strife. No group can be depended upon to render full justice to those under its control, partly because of selfish desires and partly

because of sheer inability to see life clearly from the point of view of others. That is the chief reason we no longer believe in the divine right of kings. A good and wise king could bestow many blessings upon his subjects. But kings who were both kindly and intelligent were too rare to be depended upon, while a selfish or foolish sovereign could do too much damage to be tolerated. Most Christians, however, have thus far failed to realize the perils inherent in the concentration of financial and economic power. Yet industrial autocracy is potentially more dangerous for society than political despotism. Financiers and industrial leaders who wield great power may be both socially minded and discerning; but the proportion of whom this is true is so small that society is confronted with too great a risk to justify the perpetuation of the present system.

Representative government is the device which was used to check the arbitrary power of kings and emperors. And representative government in industry is necessary if the irresponsible power of great financiers is to be limited. At present industry is usually controlled exclusively by owners and investors. Where the workers are well organized in trade unions they bargain with the employers over wages, hours, and working conditions. In a few cases employees have been elected to boards of directors and occasionally a public citizen has been selected to represent the consumers. One or two concerns have gone to the extreme of giving their employees almost entire control of the business. But

for the most part corporations are controlled by investors.

Under a system of representative government the various groups would have a share in the control of a given corporation: investors, workers, technicians, and consumers. Each group should be organized and able to select its own representatives for the board of control. Not until Christians begin to grapple seriously with the task of substituting representative government in industry for the existing financial oligarchy can brotherhood be achieved. Autocracy is a fundamental denial of the family spirit.

In politics, also, religion is ineffective unless its followers are properly organized. In the United States there is a well-established tradition that the churches ought to keep out of politics. It may well be that the churches as churches should not engage in partisan political controversies. But the forces of religion will not be effective unless they coöperate, and coöperation requires organization. Many of the barriers to brotherhood can be removed only by political processes, and many of the measures required to insure justice can be instituted only by political action.

What are the necessary devices if the change from oligarchy to genuine democracy is to be made peaceably? They seem to me to include the following: organization of the workers in nation-wide unions in order that they may be better able to bargain on equal terms with gigantic corporations; social aid for the underprivileged groups by means of the minimum

wage and family allowance, as well as by a comprehensive programme of social insurance, covering unemployment, old age, sickness, accidents, maternity cases, widows, and orphans; funds for the foregoing to be secured by sharply graduated taxation of the larger incomes and inheritances; public ownership and scientific development of natural resources and water power; social control of credit and banking; drastic public regulation of corporations; encouragement of the consumers' coöperative movement; and economic coöperation with other nations, looking toward a progressive reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.³

What is the way out? Four answers are given: reform one or both of the major parties, rely upon the bloc system, vote the Socialist ticket, help to build a new farmer-labour party. For one who believes that the Family of God can never come in any completeness until drastic changes are made in the present social order and who recognizes the important part played by politics in any programme of reconstruction, little hope is found in either of the major parties. The Republican party is the spokesman for the status quo. Normalcy is its watchword. It is dominated by great industrialists and financiers and seeks to protect their interests. It regards with abhorrence any suggestion of fundamental changes in the existing eco-

³During the past year *The World Tomorrow*, a monthly journal looking toward a social order based on the religion of Jesus, edited by Kirby Page, Devere Allen, and Reinhold Niebuhr, has been publishing a series of important articles discussing in detail these various proposals. This symposium of twenty-five articles will appear shortly in book form with the title, *A New Economic Order*, edited by Kirby Page, and published by Harcourt, Brace & Co.

nomic order. The Democratic party is torn with the controversy between the conservative South and the wet urban communities of the East. It is moving steadily away from free trade and is making an obvious bid for the support of big business. The chief difference between the two major parties seems to be with regard to prohibition and even here one is not sure just how genuine the difference is. For eight years the Republican party has placed in charge of prohibition enforcement a man who was formerly the richest distiller in the country and who is notoriously opposed to the Eighteenth Amendment. And the Democratic party has a very powerful dry element within its ranks. The differences between these two parties on other fundamental issues are so slight that it is difficult to discover them.

We are moving steadily toward the bloc system in this country, as in most others. The agricultural regions are discovering that the only way they can cope with the bankers-and-manufacturers bloc is by creating a farm bloc. The workers are also making the same discovery. Then we have a dry bloc and a wet bloc. The formation of special groups for the purpose of achieving specific objectives is inevitable in a complex society. It is obvious that the Republican or Democratic parties cannot adequately represent the desires and interests of the millions who vote for their candidates, especially when you add to the fact that there is no fundamental difference between them the further fact that within the ranks of each party there are numberless points of view on the various issues.

Prejudice against the Socialist party is so intense and widespread in the United States that it is very doubtful whether it can soon gain sufficient strength to exercise any considerable influence in American politics. Until very recently it was dominated by European doctrinaire ideas. In 1928, however, both in its national platform and candidates, it revealed a striking change in tactics. It is now much closer to the British Labour Party than to the continental socialists. Its leaders recognize the handicaps under which it labours and have expressed a willingness to co-operate in the formation of a farmer-labour party as soon as the time is ripe for such a move.

The extreme improbability that any existing political party will undertake or be able to bring about the fundamental changes in the present social order which are required before justice and good will can prevail seems to indicate the need for a new party. If the prevailing tendency toward further concentration of financial power is to be checked, if the principle of representative government is to be preserved and extended, if the privileges of life are to be shared more equitably, it will be necessary for those who are labouring for the new day to act collectively in their political activities as well as in other realms. If all those who are seeking a new social order would withdraw their support from the parties which are committed to the preservation of the existing society with all its iniquities and injustices and would act together, it would be possible within two or three decades to build a new party with sufficient strength to bring about many desirable changes in the existing

order. Long before it came into actual control of the government it would hold the balance of power between the major parties and would thus be able to gain many of its objectives.⁴

As society becomes more complex it is necessary to create more effective social organization. In a pioneer community few rules are needed, but in a highly complicated world, where the various parts are dependent upon each other, it is quite impossible to keep the peace and render justice without comprehensive international, industrial, and political organization. Not until the followers of Jesus are intelligent participants in the task of creating the required social machinery can they hope to make his religion practicable for individuals, groups, and nations.

3. IF WE ABANDON THE DOCTRINE THAT THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS

We must abandon the doctrine that the end justifies the means and replace it with the idea that only those weapons are permissible which are appropriate in a home. The extent to which well-intentioned people have resorted to evil in order that good might be done is simply appalling. We have already examined some of the evidence which shows how frequently Christians have used weapons of

⁴The League for Independent Political Action has recently been organized by John Dewey, Paul H. Douglas, Sherwood Eddy, Norman Thomas, Oswald Garrison Villard, Devere Allen, James Weldon Johnson, A. J. Muste, Harry W. Laidler, Robert Morss Lovett, Reinhold Niebuhr, W. E. B. DuBois, Kirby Page, etc., for the purpose of conducting an educational campaign on behalf of a new political realignment. Information may be obtained from Howard Y. Williams, 347 Madison Avenue, New York City.

violence. There are hardly any extremes of cruelty to which they have not gone. How did it happen that the Christian church, in many of its branches, officially used torture in dealing with heretics? A false assumption and the doctrine that the end justifies the means were responsible for the shedding of rivers of blood. Consider the Inquisition, for example. For the most part, the men who administered this terrible institution were conscientious and zealous churchmen. Like most other Christians of that age they believed that membership in the church was essential to salvation. Acceptance of the beliefs and practices of the church were required of all members. Heresy was punished with excommunication, and if a man died while outside the church it was assumed that he would go to hell, a literal lake of fire, and burn throughout all eternity. Since nothing could be worse than this awful fate the church mercifully sought to prevent heresy and thus save a precious soul from eternal torment. If persuasion failed, then coercion was used; if mild forms of punishment were unavailing, then extreme measures were adopted. In the end the church which was founded on the corner stone of love toward God and man was starving men in foul dungeons and burning them at the stake for the good of their souls. Not the Catholic church alone but various branches of Protestantism practised diabolic cruelty for several centuries on the ground that high and holy ends justified any means.

Out of the literally thousands of other examples available let us consider a recent one, the defense of

atrocities during the World War alike by German and Allied Christians. In both cases we find the same false assumption and the same deadly doctrine. The vast majority of Germans thought they were fighting in self-defense.⁵ Victimized by propaganda and obsessed with fear, they thought the war was necessary. For decades they had been warned by their nationalists and militarists against the aggressive designs of barbarous Russians, decadent Frenchmen, and perfidious Britons. Finding themselves and their allies far outdistanced by the combined armies and navies of their potential enemies, they endured the staggering burden of taxation and conscription occasioned by the race of armaments. When the war came they thought they were fighting in defense of country, civilization, and the Kingdom of God. None save a few extreme militarists wanted war or relished the idea of killing their fellows. But it was necessary, they reasoned, and so they exhibited great valour and sacrificial devotion. At all costs the war must be won, otherwise their culture and civilization would be swept away by the enemies they had been taught to despise. When all other weapons failed they resorted to unrestricted submarine warfare. It is a melancholy fact that the resultant atrocities were defended on grounds of necessity by many German Christians. A friend of mine told me that during the war one of his relatives stayed in the home of relatives of one of the best-known German theologians and that on the Sunday

⁵For the most authoritative and judicious account of the causes of the war see Sidney B. Fay, *The Origins of the World War*.

following the sinking of the *Lusitania* they went to church and participated in a public celebration because they thought they were winning the war.

If this seems incredible to some readers let them remind themselves how Christians in England, France, and the United States felt and acted during those terrible days. Most Christians in Allied countries thought they were fighting in self-defense. This is the way they reasoned: for forty years the Huns have been preparing; their plans were all blue-printed; they were bent on world conquest or downfall; it was to be first Belgium, then France, Russia, England, Europe, the United States, and other distant countries. What can you do when confronted with barbarians determined on conquest? One English divine expressed it this way: "You might as well tickle a tiger as attempt to plead with a German." War was horrible but necessary, they said. Otherwise civilization would be destroyed and the Kingdom of God set back by centuries. And so most Allied Christians made use of or approved the various weapons of war, including the most terrible instrument of all, the blockade. To the extent that was possible the Allies put an arm of steel about Germany and strangled multitudes to death. More men, women, and children were starved to death by the blockade than were killed by all the submarine attacks and air raids. And all the while multitudes of Christians in Allied lands were assembling in their churches and thanking God they were winning the war and saving civilization. To this tragic end will a false assumption and a pernicious doctrine lead the followers of Jesus.

Capital punishment is in accordance with the old pagan law of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and a life for a life. So much crime, so much punishment. Multitudes of Christian people uphold hanging on the ground that the end—the protection of society—justifies it. Not infrequently lynching and mob violence have been defended on this same ground. The use of machine guns against strikers and other acts of industrial violence are justified by many Christian employers. Many Christian parents uphold bayonet practice for college students and some advocate compulsory military training for high-school boys. Millions of churchmen acquiesce in or actively support preparations for gas warfare. The people of the United States are spending more than six hundred million dollars annually on the current expenses of the army and navy because such a large proportion of them believe that the end justifies the means.

If Jesus' way of life is to prove practicable Christians must select their methods with as much care as they choose their ends. A noble objective does not justify the use of a vicious means. Burning at the stake is neither an effective nor an ethical way of treating heretics. Starvation and drowning are neither necessary nor moral methods of resisting enemies. The more righteous the cause, the more destructive an evil weapon becomes. Only those instruments are permissible which are in accordance with the spirit of the end sought. Criminals must be met with attitudes and practices which do not violate the spirit of the home. Restraint and separation, yes; retaliation and revenge, no. National security must be sought

in ways that are consistent with international brotherhood: conciliation, arbitration, judicial decision, conference and coöperation; but not battles and blockades. In every realm means must be reconciled with ends.

4. IF WE ARE WILLING TO TAKE THE CONSEQUENCES

But ethical means may not always prove adequate. To refrain from the use of violence may mean destruction for the innocent. The tragic truth is that we have no way of guaranteeing safety. Armed policemen and capital punishment do not safeguard society absolutely. Battleships and heavy artillery do not insure security. If a method is to be repudiated or abandoned because it fails to produce perfect results, then indeed are we utterly defenseless. Unfortunately, in an imperfect world there is no way completely to avoid danger and destruction. The religion of Jesus is not practicable unless its followers are willing to run risks and accept consequences. The family life will continue to be a perilous way to live as long as blindness and bigotry, fear and selfishness prevail. To trust men is a hazardous procedure. Love and forgiveness may be met with ingratitude and cruelty. Many a father's heart has been broken by the base attitudes of his son. Brother has frequently been betrayed by brother. And so those who are primarily concerned about comfort and ease and safety cannot be faithful disciples of Jesus. In our day, as in previous ages, to follow him closely may lead to pain and suffering.

The present generation makes an individual pay

a heavy price for practising brotherhood. In many sections if a white man treats a Negro as a brother and an equal, severe penalties are visited upon him. In these communities to invite a coloured person to take a meal with a white family will lead to ostracism and bitter hostility and may even provoke violence. For a teacher or social worker or minister to advocate equality in all respects between the different races is to run the almost certain risk of losing his position, if not to endanger his life. The advocacy of complete political and social equality between Negroes and whites simply will not be tolerated. In one community a college professor permitted a coloured servant to invite her friends into the rear of the house. On a gala occasion, when he and his family were away, he granted the servant and her Negro friends the use of the entire house. Whereupon the whole town was thrown into an uproar. Indignation gatherings were held; a committee waited upon the professor; dire threats were uttered; an ultimatum was issued. Shortly thereafter the professor moved to another state. There are some communities in the United States where a Negro is not permitted to stay overnight. By a tragic paradox, feelings on the race question often run highest in the very communities that regard themselves as the most religious.

In many college communities the practice of interracial brotherhood is vigorously opposed. Very few fraternities ignore racial boundaries in choosing new members. Negroes are barred as a rule, and foreign students are usually discriminated against, although there are exceptions in both cases. The native-white

student who associates freely with other students of different colours and races is often regarded as queer and frequently is ostracized by his fellows. Students from India and Africa are frequently refused service in hotels, restaurants, and barber shops. Many of these men and women, after being refused lodgings and meals in Christian institutions in this country and treated shamefully on numerous occasions, return to their homeland embittered against the United States and the Christian religion. Not infrequently Jewish students are ostracized by other students. It is a rare community indeed where the practice of treating men of all races as brothers and equals is encouraged.

It is dangerous also to take seriously Jesus' challenge to overcome evil with good. In times of supreme national crisis to love enemies is regarded as high treason. A man who is unwilling to wage war against the foe is regarded as a traitor. True enough, exceptions are made in the case of Quakers and members of similar religious groups, that is, they are granted noncombatant service. But those able-bodied men of draft age who are unwilling on conscientious grounds to take orders from the military or naval authorities are imprisoned. One of my closest friends was sentenced to twenty-five years in Leavenworth for no other crime than taking Jesus seriously. In 1916 he went to England and devoted himself to relief work with prisoners-of-war. When drafted he returned to this country and upon refusing to put on an army uniform and do military duty he was treated worse than a common criminal. Scores of conscien-

tious objectors were treated with extreme cruelty. Chaplains and Y. M. C. A. secretaries were often bitterly hostile to men who refused to fight. Indeed the entire country was inclined to regard them as cowardly and unpatriotic. After the war was over conscientious objectors were released with a dishonourable discharge. At least one great university refused to enrol an individual who had gone to prison for the sake of his conscience.

Even in peace time considerable hostility is manifested toward pacifists. General Pershing once said that he regarded an individual who had declared that he would not engage in any war as "guilty of a treasonable act and I would favour a law disfranchising any such unworthy citizens." The declaration not to engage in war was described by a prominent Catholic Vicar-General as "constructive treason and quintessential absurdity. To foster such a code is to nurture a serpent in the very bosom of the nation." While a distinguished Protestant clergyman describes such a statement of purpose as "treasonable—damnable—and no true American citizen would sign it. Such a resolution evidently emanated from the enemies of this government and the real enemies of peace and progress." The president of a state university said that "the government of the United States ought to deal with such a man for treason."

There are a good many colleges in this country where a thoroughgoing pacifist is not allowed to speak. On a number of occasions invitations to such speakers have been cancelled. Prominent officials of national patriotic organizations have boasted of

their success in preventing pacifists from getting a hearing. In several institutions students who opposed compulsory military training were expelled. Freshmen who are reluctant to take military courses are frequently intimidated or met with taunts and sneers. One student who launched a crusade against the Reserve Officers' Training Corps was issued an ultimatum by his foster-parents who were members of the faculty: abandon such an effort or leave home. At a leading state university an effort was made to persuade several members of the faculty who were known to be opponents of military training to make a public statement to this effect, but not one would do so. It was generally agreed that any professor who took such a stand would incur the hostility of the administration and perhaps lose his position. On a certain campus a vigorous effort was made to secure the discharge of a student pastor because of his opposition to military training. A local banker refused to make a loan to the church employing this man as long as he was retained. At one university military officers openly announced that they were going to secure the discharge of a student secretary who was known as a pacifist. In a score of ways, direct and indirect, pressure is brought to bear upon individuals and organizations opposing militarism in our colleges.

Those who seek to apply the religion of Jesus in the realm of economics and industry are also likely to meet with abuse and opposition. When the Family of God comes on earth self-interest and competition will not be enthroned. It seems obvious, therefore, that followers of Jesus should seek to supplant many

of the existing motives and methods with new incentives and new procedures. And yet most Christians are ardent defenders of the present economic order. They are not only failing to make any serious effort to change the prevailing system of producing and distributing the goods and service needed, they vigorously object to anyone else seeking to bring about these changes. And so it is highly dangerous to advocate the transformation of the competitive system into a coöperative commonwealth.

In a hundred subtle ways pressure is brought to bear upon business men to make them conform. The open-shop movement, or so-called American plan, is well organized and vigorously promoted in many communities. It is strongly opposed to representative government in industry and seeks to perpetuate the control of owners and investors. It regards well-organized national unions as subversive and dangerous and attempts to cripple or destroy them. In many cities the employer who runs a union shop is subjected to pressure from different directions. At luncheon meetings, in the club room, on the golf links, his associates are likely to manifest hostility toward workers' organizations and consciously or unconsciously seek to induce him to abandon collective bargaining through a national union. There are many cases where such a man is discriminated against by other industrialists and especially by bankers. The refusal to make loans is a common weapon held over the head of a business man who will not conform.

The worker who is actively opposed to industrial

autocracy is heavily penalized by many corporations. Not infrequently companies discharge any employee who is known to be a member of a national union. The open advocacy of a new economic order simply is not permitted in numerous plants and mines. In 1924 dire threats were often made against any worker found guilty of so mild a crime as voting for La Follette, and four years later any employee who cast a ballot for Norman Thomas was likely to be regarded as a dangerous character.

On more occasions than I like to remember, professors and ministers have told me that they dared not express their opinions out loud. It is true that some educators and clergymen are openly denouncing the autocracy and ruthlessness of the present industrial system and are advocating a new economic order, but not many. Any teacher or minister who regards extreme congestion of wealth as socially dangerous, who looks upon the mad scramble for personal privilege and power as a denial of brotherhood, who advocates representative government in industry, who favours public ownership coupled with scientific operation of natural resources and means of communication and transportation, who is opposed to speculation and gambling in the necessary resources of life—in short, who is opposed to the present competitive system, is almost certain to be attacked as an undesirable citizen.

Instead of meeting fact with fact and argument with argument, too often abuse and vilification are resorted to. In this country the easiest way to dispose

of an opponent is to make the public believe that he is a radical, a red, a socialist, a communist. These words are bandied about with extreme recklessness and utter disregard for the accuracy of the characterization. Indeed there are several national organizations that specialize in vicious attacks upon persons who advocate fundamental changes in the present social order.⁶ These national societies have flooded the country with distortions and falsehoods against numerous educators, ministers, and officials of peace organizations. Their activities assumed such large proportions that the Federal Council of Churches devoted an entire issue of the *Informations Service* to an analysis of their literature.⁷ On February 27, 1928, Senator Walsh of Montana delivered a long address on the floor of the Senate exposing the unreliable character of the statements of several super-patriots. To an astonishing degree the public has proved itself gullible. The most preposterous and unproved charges have been widely accepted as the gospel truth.

Perhaps the seriousness of the situation cannot be revealed more adequately than by a quotation from a conservative source. In the *American Legion Monthly* for July, 1927, was printed a notable article by Rupert Hughes, well-known biographer of George Washing-

⁶Included in this list are The Key Men of America, The Industrial Defense Association, The Better America Federation, The National Civic Federation, The National Security League, as well as some of the national officers of The Daughters of the American Revolution and The American Legion.

⁷May 5, 1928. A copy may be secured for fifteen cents from 105 East 22d St., New York City. See also the volume *Professional Patriots*, by Norman Hapgood and Sidney Howard.

ton. In this article Mr. Hughes makes this confession:

"Now I am as bitter against pacifism as anybody. . . . There is nobody who abhors Bolshevism more than I do." But he then goes on to draw this indictment: "Great numbers of our fellow-citizens have made war on speakers whose doctrines they disapprove of; they have invaded halls and driven out audiences; they have prevented auditoriums from being rented to speakers. . . . The most un-American crimes are being almost daily committed in the name of Americanism. Many of the most violent protectors of Americanism are doing their best to destroy it or to make it a byword of oppression and intolerance. . . . I am ashamed to think of the numbers of Americans who have been beaten, tarred and feathered, ridden on rails, and often killed for merely trusting in the fundamental principle of this country, which is freedom. . . . Men have been persecuted for advising changes in our Government which have since become almost foundation principles. . . . Pacifists are called traitors—a word which was used of George Washington once. The favourite word of abuse is 'red.' To call a person 'red' is supposed to end all argument, and amount to a sentence of imprisonment."

An unknown number of professors, ministers, and social workers have lost their positions because of their efforts on behalf of a new social order. The size of this group can never be known because the real reasons for their discharge are obscured. Institutions are usually reluctant to admit that they are penalizing an employee for unpopular opinions, so other explanations are given for severing his connections with

the organization. But it is undeniably true that many colleges and churches will not retain a teacher or clergyman who is known as a "radical." Blindness and bigotry, fear and selfishness, still prevail, so men and women who seek to follow their ideals are met with abuse and opposition and persecution. Society still treats those who rise too high above its standards very much as it does those who fall too far below.

5. IF WE DISCOVER AND UTILIZE SPIRITUAL RESOURCES⁸

It will not be possible to follow the religion of Jesus unless we discover and make use of the resources which enabled him to endure to the end. Insight and understanding, love and sacrificial devotion, patience and persistence, confidence and daring, are all essential to the family life. Fortunately, there are vast potential powers resident within each of us upon which we draw. We are by nature equipped to live in a home. When man is normal he exhibits the virtues of the family. Sympathy and kindness and mutual sharing are perfectly natural.

The greatest tragedies of life are found in the fact that so many people fail to use their latent energies and hidden potentialities. In every realm there is a vast chasm between what we know and what we do not understand, between what we actually accomplish and what we are able to do, between what we are and what we are capable of becoming. We are ignorant

⁸ See *Methods of Private Religious Living*, by H. N. Wieman.

when we might be wise, weak when we might be strong, defeated when we might be victorious.

Much of what was regarded as knowledge yesterday is now known to be error; and many of the unchallenged assumptions of to-day will to-morrow be demonstrated as false. The constituent elements of the earth have doubtless been the same for æons, but radium, the most marvellous of all, was discovered only twenty-five years ago. The atmosphere has been the same for unnumbered centuries, but only within the past two decades has mankind been able to send radio messages around the world. And the thrilling fact is that we are in all probability on the verge of making undreamed-of and even more marvellous discoveries.

Man uses only a small fraction of his physical strength or mental power. Through ignorance or carelessness or recklessness he goes through life afflicted and enervated, deluded and deceived. In moments of great peril, individuals have exhibited astounding strength. Extraordinarily few persons ever utilize more than a small percentage of their physical potentialities. Still greater is the waste of mental energy. Now and then we see a man or woman with an orderly and disciplined mind, but most people have slovenly mental habits and substitute prejudice or passion for clear thinking. Once in a while an individual trains his voice or hand or eye and produces harmony or beauty. But for every singer or violinist or artist thus discovered and trained, hundreds of others go through life without realizing or releasing their æsthetic gifts.

But it is in the realm of the spirit that the greatest tragedies are found. Man is created in the spiritual image of God and is equipped for fellowship with the Eternal. Here and there we see an individual with keen sensitiveness who is at home in the realm of the spirit. Jesus, of course, is the supreme example of one who was certain of the reality and accessibility of God and whose deepest joys emerged from communion with the Father. He certainly expected his followers to enjoy this companionship also. Indeed, the religion of Jesus is utterly meaningless unless communication with God is possible. Some of Jesus' disciples through the centuries have repeated his spiritual experience to a marked degree. God was as real to St. Francis or John Wesley as the birds or human beings. Most Christians have had at least a few hours when they were vividly conscious of the Divine presence. The tragedy is that for all except a few these experiences come too infrequently. Most people fail to fulfil the conditions of spiritual knowledge and power and as a result lead barren and impotent lives.

In every realm the possession of knowledge and power is dependent upon the fulfilment of conditions. Years of painstaking research are behind all the great scientific discoveries. Someone has said that musical or artistic genius is one per cent. inspiration and ninety-nine per cent. perspiration. Friendship is a fine art, and few there are who have found its deeper meanings. Love always costs, and the nobler its quality the harder one has to struggle in order to attain it.

The spiritual resources which were available to Jesus are open to us on the same terms. We, too, can

be vividly conscious of God's presence; we can listen to His voice and share our problems with Him; we can gain insight and love and courage from Him. We, too, can be a brother to man; going about doing good; sharing, healing, restoring. We, too, can live as though the Family God were a present reality if—if we will fulfil the necessary conditions. The price of spiritual power includes these: the losing of self in a great task on behalf of humanity, the doing of which is vastly more important than personal comfort or safety; the cultivation of the arts of solitude; the cultivation of the beautiful; the practice of fellowship; and the willingness to follow the gleam at any cost. If we do these things faithfully year after year we shall find ourselves rising higher and higher toward the fulness of the measure of the stature of Christ.

Self-centred people do not often possess great spiritual power. He that seeks to save his life shall lose it, while he that abandons himself in a great cause shall find life. Preoccupation with one's own comfort and pleasure is a primary explanation of spiritual barrenness. Prayer often lacks vitality because an individual is not conscious of anything really worth praying for. Not until a man has caught sight of the desperate need of some other person and realizes his own inability to relieve this need is he likely to find spiritual reality.

There is an appalling amount of misery in this world. Nearly one third of the human race is hungry, literally hungry. Millions of children are born and live

their days without ever having all the food they really need. All over the earth fathers hear the cries of their young for bread without being able to give them plenty. Not only is this true in the Orient and in many parts of Europe, there is also widespread destitution in the United States. Evidence has already been cited showing the extent of poverty in this country. The fact that the standard of living is immeasurably higher here than abroad and that the percentage in need is much smaller than in other lands should not blind us to the fact that even in prosperous America millions of people are always in destitution or on the very brink of want. Consider the misery caused by enforced unemployment. Here is a man able to work and willing to work who is unable to find employment. Day after day he tramps the street from factory to factory, money gives out, supplies are gone, debts pile up, morale sinks lower and lower, character deteriorates, and frequently the end is catastrophe. Yet there are in this country at a given time from one million to five million workers unable to find a job.

The volume of physical pain is simply staggering. Most of the human race never come under the care of a trained physician, surgeon, or nurse. Ignorance, superstition, poverty, unsanitary surroundings, bad housing, industrial diseases and accidents—all these strike down their thousands. Here is a home in which the bread-winner is stricken; he will never be able to work again; his pay stops. His meagre savings are soon gone. Wife and children are compelled to get under the burden. Month after month he lies helpless

and hopeless, a dead weight upon his family. There are hundreds of thousands of such households in every country.

Consider also the number of homes in which the light of love has gone out and the family dwells in the blackness of discord and hatred. An alarming percentage of families are terribly unhappy. Divorce-court records reveal only a small part of the maladjustment. Here is a husband who sinks so low that he treats with contempt and violence the woman he had sworn to love and cherish, taunting her with his unfaithfulness and flaunting his lust before her eyes. Here is a son who exhibits base ingratitude toward his parents and wrecks their lives by his unfilial conduct. In a hundred ways members of families cause each other grief and agony.

Think, too, of the wasted lives, men and women who are simply drifting, with no purpose and no goal save the enjoyment of bodily thrills and sensations. Multitudes of people live on the froth of life and frequently have the bad taste that comes on the morning after the night before. Vast numbers are driven with the mad desire for surface pleasures and consume their energies in the vain effort to satisfy physical desires. Eating, drinking, and being merry seems to be the highest ambition of multitudes, living like swine when they have the potentialities of sons and daughters of God.

In a world of such appalling misery and need the man who draws within his own shell and goes his way with utter unconcern is likely to be spiritually impotent. If an individual really desires insight and

power let him get under the load of human suffering and lift until his strength is gone. Hunger and pain can be greatly reduced if a sufficient number of people care, care enough to dedicate time and energy to their alleviation. Homes do not need to be broken and lives do not need to be empty. Many of the sorrows and heartaches of the earth are preventable. And no man can ever be himself who fails to bear his share of humanity's burdens. Self-centredness is paralyzing, dedication is liberating.

The second condition of spiritual insight and power is the cultivation of the arts of solitude. Quietness is necessary to inner growth. The speed with which many people live is responsible for numerous breakdowns in character. If a man wants poise and serenity he must learn to get quiet. There is profound wisdom in the ancient admonition: "Be still and know that I am God." The deeper meanings of spiritual reality can never be apprehended by those who fail to spend much time alone.

The first stage is simple relaxation. Let imagination have full play and mind wander where it will. Soon a train of thought will lead to serious meditation or reflection. If one is living daily in close contact with misery or is dedicating self to a great cause, contemplation will lead to yearning; for more insight and wisdom, for more strength and courage. "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." Consciously or unconsciously a man will voice his petition or find himself engaged in passionate intercession. And if he persists in the practice month

after month the time will arrive when on beyond meditation and yearning and petition there will come the greatest of all experiences, a sense of communion with the Eternal. In such an hour God becomes the great reality and one is conscious of a divine fellowship. Spirit goes out to spirit, mind meets mind, heart responds to heart. New insights come, clouds break away, light pierces the darkness. One feels an inrush of power, is conscious of new daring, and is gripped by a resolute determination. One's whole being is transformed by a great friendship. Passing the love of a mother for a son, or a wife for a husband, is the love of God for His children. Man is made for fellowship with the Father and only blindness and inertia cause him to live as an alien and an enemy.

The pursuit of beauty is a great aid to the discovery of God. It is not accidental that so many of our deepest experiences occur in places of beauty—by a lake side, on the sea, in a forest, on a mountain, under the starry heavens, at a symphony, before a great painting, in a cathedral. The tragedy of life is that so many people dwell in squalor and ugliness. Enforced poverty makes the enjoyment of beauty difficult for many millions. But most readers of these lines can find beauty if they will search for it. No man is too poor to enjoy the glories of the firmament or to commune with the sunset. Music is accessible to those who will listen. The radio opens up new possibilities for many a home. Careful selection will flood the house with the melodies of song and symphony. And then there is always the beauty of a good book waiting to refresh our spirits. A verse or a story or an essay

may revive us when we are low. Not far away from most of us is a beautiful church where we may steal away alone for a period of restful meditation or worship with the congregation. If we would forego lesser pleasures most of us could go more often to the sea or forest or mountains and be restored to our right mind by close contact with nature.

Many of the most memorable hours of my own life have been spent in places of great beauty. Fortunately for me many of the conference sites to which I go frequently are located in glorious spots: Lake Geneva, Silver Bay, Blue Ridge, Northfield, Eagles Mere, Hollister, Estes Park, Asilomar. Then, too, my investigations have carried me into many beautiful places. Never shall I forget a gorgeous sunset from the Acropolis, nor the even more wonderful colouring on the Volga at twilight. A moonlight night on the Atlantic when its surface was as smooth as glass and a wild storm at sea will always remain in my memory. The harbour of Hongkong, the Golden Horn of Constantinople, the river scene in Budapest—who can ever forget them? The lights of lower Manhattan from a ferry, the majesty of the Lincoln Memorial, the glories of the Rockies, the stately pines of Louisiana, the splendour of Golden Gate, the mist on Loch Lomond, the stillness of a Yorkshire forest, an autumn evening on the Hudson, the eternal snow of Fuji, the cathedral of Cologne, the domes of Moscow, the minarets of St. Sophia, the Sistine Madonna, the Winged Victory, Tannhäuser rendered by German artists, the flash of a hundred searchlights over London, the pounding of the surf on the rocks at Folke-

stone, the Alpine glow on the Jungfrau—all these will ever be a part of my very being.

Fellowship is a fourth condition of spiritual growth. The sharing of life on a high level with two or three kindred spirits is necessary to the release of one's personality. Man is made for companionship and starves without it. But fellowship is a delicate plant and few cultivate it with sufficient care. The free interchange of confidences about the deeper things of life is altogether too rare. Men discuss trivialities and irrelevancies more readily than they bare their souls to each other.

There was a reason why Jesus chose the Twelve and why every great religious leader gathers a group about him. And the spiritual destitution of many a person is explained by the absence of fellowship. So if a man wants life indeed let him spend time on friendship. When two or three or ten come together with a common aspiration and purpose and determination their wisdom and strength are magnified many fold. My own experience leaves me in no doubt on this point. For a dozen years I have had the joy of close fellowship with a small group of seekers after light and life. Time and again we have witnessed the achievements of the group mind and spirit. Deeper insight, keener sympathy, greater determination, and more courage emerge from a group where the members are in tune with each other. Of all the formative experiences in my college days, none exceeded in importance the half-hour meetings in the early morning three days a week. Sometimes we talked, sometimes one would read aloud, sometimes we sang, very often we just

sat quietly together and communed. And the group silence was most rewarding of all. Two members of the group are now teaching in Syria, one is principal of a school in Paraguay, one is a missionary in India, one went as a teacher to Japan, while others are engaged in fruitful activities in various parts of the United States. As I have gone about the colleges in the years since graduation I have observed again and again the moulding influence of a group. Fellowship is a condition and a source of spiritual power.

Not fellowship with the living merely but also communion with the great ones of other ages. Biography opens the door and permits another life to enter our own. Foolish is the person who fails to live with the towering figures of history. And the nobler the character with whom we dwell the finer will be the quality of our own thinking. A man can easily revolutionize his thoughts and deeds by spending an hour a day with the right biography. Measured by mediocrity we may feel self-satisfied, but when we realize how far short we fall of the stature of the truly great, a divine discontent possesses us. Sometimes the odds against us appear too heavy, but when we see the vastly greater obstacles against which some noble soul struggled successfully, we take courage. Often we feel aggrieved over some mild abuse or trivial persecution, but are made ashamed when we compare our lot with the suffering and agony of the earth's pioneers.

Since the inspiration that comes from a biography is in direct ratio to the nobility of the life described, it naturally follows that the biography of Jesus is the

most stimulating of all.⁹ No greater tragedy has ever occurred than the obscuration of that matchless character by the wranglings of theologians. The followers of Jesus, in their eagerness to do him homage, have all but destroyed his reality. Jesus does not need to be defended. His life is its own best defense. All he requires is that men shall be exposed to his personality. Half an hour a day in intelligent study of his example and teaching and quiet meditation on the meaning of his life and death will transform utterly the character of any man or woman.

A fifth condition of spiritual progress is willingness to follow the light when it comes and to surge forward in pursuit of one's ideals at any cost. To him that has shall be given and from him that has not shall be taken away, is an inexorable law of life. A muscle that is not used soon atrophies, a talent that is not exercised dies away, light that is not followed fades out. When a man in an hour of exaltation catches a glimpse of some new truth or discovers the answer to a perplexing question, he had better follow the gleam, or the light will go out and the latter darkness will be blacker than the former. There is genuine wisdom in the words of the ancient hymn: "I do not ask to see the distant scene, one step enough for me." Light for one step is all that a person needs if—if he takes that step. The technique of spiritual growth is this: a feeble ray and a little progress; then more illumination and more strides forward. The individual who

⁹See *By An Unknown Disciple*, an anonymous interpretation of rare beauty, published by Doubleday, Doran & Co., also *The Hidden Years*, by John Oxenham. Both of these are invaluable.

fails to follow the dim light he has and who waits for the full glare of noonday before advancing will never rise to the spiritual heights which he is capable of ascending.

It is perilous business to forsake the ideals formed when a man is at his best. If at such a time he decides to abandon all discriminatory practices against other groups and races and to apply the principle of brotherhood in new ways, it will be spiritual suicide to shrink back because of misunderstanding and opposition. If he concludes that he ought to refuse to take military training or to engage in war or to uphold armed preparedness, his character will deteriorate if he yields to pressure and goes against his convictions. If in choosing his life work he decides that he ought to enter a certain profession or occupation where his particular abilities will probably yield the heaviest dividends for humanity, and yet goes ahead and enters another calling which offers him a better prospect of securing personal privileges and luxuries and powers, he is not likely to develop the spiritual capacities latent within himself. The highway of life is strewn with the spiritual corpses of men and women who failed to fulfil the conditions of vision and power or who refused to follow their ideals because of the difficulties and perils confronting them.

But the glorious good news is that an individual can rise Godward if he wants to. By nature he is equipped for understanding and knowledge, for victory and power, for fellowship and partnership with God and man. If, after taking stock of his spiritual condition, a person discovers that he ranks very low

let him spend an hour in examining his record to see if he has fulfilled the necessary conditions of inner development. Has he lost sight of personal comfort and safety in eager dedication to some noble cause? Does he regularly and persistently cultivate the arts of solitude? Is he engaged in the pursuit of beauty? Does he devote time to friendship and fellowship? Is he following all the light he has and is he resolved to achieve his ideals at any cost?

Any person who will fulfil the necessary conditions can progressively live as if the Family of God has already come. But he will not be able to succeed completely the first time he tries, nor in a month nor in a year. Practice, long practice, is essential to perfection. The higher achievements all require sustained care and attention, whether they be in the realms of science or art, ethics or religion. But any normal person can progressively come into a vital religious experience and can gradually achieve a character more and more like that of Jesus.

It is extremely unfortunate that fellowship with God cannot be described in intelligible terms to one who has had no experience in this realm. Words are utterly inadequate vehicles to convey the deeper meanings of life. All we can do is to furnish such a stimulus to another person that he will accept our premise as a hypothesis and proceed to experiment for himself. This is true of all the higher values. Beauty cannot be described, it must be experienced. How would you convey your impressions of a gorgeous sunset to someone who is colour blind? How would you describe the emotions that sweep over you when

at a well-rendered symphony to someone who is stone deaf? How would you share the feelings that are aroused by a lovely verse with someone who has no appreciation of poetry? How would you explain the meaning of affection to one who has never loved? There can be no proxies on the higher levels. Every man must climb up for himself. But when he arrives he will have no need of proof that a rose is beautiful or that the Parthenon is noble in its dimensions or that the love of a mother is true. No more does a man require proof of the existence or accessibility of God after he has experienced an hour of companionship with the Father. And until that hour comes words cannot convey any satisfactory conception of the reality of the experience.

The religion of Jesus is practicable for us to-day if we will fulfil the conditions he fulfilled in his day: undertake a supreme task, the doing of which is more important than one's own life; spend time in silent meditation and intercession and communion with the Eternal; cultivate friendship and fellowship with a group of intimates and with the great ones of other ages; consciously and steadfastly pursue beauty; dedicate self unreservedly to the way of sacrificial good will and follow the gleam at all costs. If we will do these faithfully and persistently, we will progressively be filled with the wisdom and love and power which enabled Jesus to walk the way of the Cross and to become the Deliverer of mankind.

INDEX

- Abbot, Lyman, 224.
 Aedney, W. F., 116, 117, 118, 152.
 Alexander VI, 160, 178.
 Allen, Devere, 288, 291.
 American Legion, 303.
American Legion Monthly, 303.
 Anderson, James, 200.
 Anderson, R. N., 218.
 Angus, S., 3, 56.
 Anselm, S., 190.
 Arnold, Thos., 172.
 Athanasian Creed, 118.
 Atrocities, 293.
 Augsburg Confession, 268.

 Babington, C., 208, 209.
 Bachmann, 216.
 Bacon, L. W., 162.
 Bacon, Leonard, 216.
 Baker, R. S., 244.
 Ballard, C. R., 171.
 Banks, 259.
 Baptist Bible Union, 270.
 Baring-Gould, S., 111, 152, 164,
 165, 167, 168, 183.
 Barnes, H. E., 240.
 Beard, C. A., 202, 223.
 Beauty, 312 ff.
 Beecher, H. W., 174.
 Bellows, H. W., 106.
 Benedict, Marion J., 17.
 Bernard, 92.
 Best, Mary Agnes, 135.
 Better America Federation, 303.
 Biography, 315.
 Blandina, 77.
 Blockade, 294.

 Bowdler, H. M., 204.
 Bowen, Francis, 201.
 Boynton, N., 227.
 Brace, C. L., 1, 57, 58, 63, 101, 208.
 Browne, Louis, 136.
 Brownlow, W. G., 215.
 Buckle, 150.
 Buckley, J. M., 105.
 Bundy, Walter E., 14.
 Burke, Edmund, 199, 204.
 Bushnell, Horace, 107.
 Butterfield, K. L., 255.
By an Unknown Disciple, 316.
 Byford, C. T., 184.

 Cadoux, C. J., 53, 69, 70, 89.
 Calvert, E. R., 240.
 Calvin, John, 130.
 Campbell, R. J., 224.
 Canfield, Leon Hardy, 73.
 Capital Punishment, 237 ff., 295.
 Carey, Mathew, 128, 132.
 Carpus, 76.
 Carver, T. N., 250.
 Case, S. J., 3, 7, 14, 23.
 Castleman, T. T., 214.
 Celibacy, 154 ff.
 Cesare Borgia, 178.
 Chaucer, 179.
 Cheyney, E. P., 197, 198.
 Child Labour, 197, 199.
 Civil War, 105 ff.
 Clapp, T., 214.
 Class Divisions, 26.
 Cobham, C. D., 120.
 Coleman, C. B., 88, 90.
 Colquhoun, P., 202.

- Competition, 250, 264, 282.
 Compromise, 80.
 Concentration, 257.
 Conformity, 301.
 Constantine, 87 ff.
 Cooper, Myles, 104, 194.
 Corporations, 258.
 Corruption, 177 ff.
 Cost of Living, 253.
 Coulton, G. G., 96, 110, 156, 157,
 161, 162, 166, 186, 189, 190, 209,
 210.
 Courage, 72.
 Cox, E. S., 242.
 Creeds, 268.
 Criminals, 279.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 111.
 Cross, Meaning of, 31 ff.
 Crusades, 90 ff.

 Darrow, Clarence, 240.
 Darwin, Chas., 145.
 Daughters of American Revolution,
 303.
 Davis, J. J., 257.
 Davis, Wm. S., 110, 188.
 Decius, 74.
 Democratic Party, 289.
 Dew, T. R., 213.
 Dewey, John, 291.
 Dickey, Samuel, 3, 8, 12, 23, 57.
 Diocletian, 74.
 Discrimination, 297.
 Divine Right, 191 ff., 261.
 Donatist Controversy, 113.
 Dorchester, Daniel, 163.
 Doubnow, S. M., 138.
 Dougal, Lily, 18.
 Douglas, Paul H., 291.
 Drunkenness, 163.
 Du Bois, W. E. B., 291.
 Duke of Alva, 99.

 Ecclesiasticism, 268.
 Economic Injustice, 249 ff.
 Eddy, Sherwood, 291.

 Edwards, Jonathan, 173, 174.
 Eldridge, C. D., 1.
 Emmet, C. W., 18.
 Employers Associations, 259.
 Ends and Means, 291 ff.
 Epistle to Diognetus, 64.
 Essenes, 8.
 Eusebius, 8, 75, 76.
 Evans, H. W., 242, 248.

 Fairbairn, Principal, 127.
 Family Loyalty, 64 ff.
 Farmers, 255.
 Fay, S. B., 228, 293.
 Fear, 58.
 Federal Council of Churches, 228,
 243, 249, 302.
 Fellowship, 77 ff., 314.
 Feudalism, 110, 185 ff., 263.
 Figgis, J. N., 191, 192.
 Finney, C. G., 174.
 Firth, John B., 88.
 Flick, Clarence, 186.
 Foakes-Jackson, F. J., 81, 150.
 Foster, S. S., 215.
 Freedom of Speech, 303.
 Furniss, E. S., 202.

 Galileo, 147.
 Garrison, W. L., 219.
 Gary, E. H., 262.
 General Assembly, 269.
 Germans, 27.
 Gibbon, Edward, 53, 116, 156.
 Gilbert, H. G., 105.
 Gillin, John L., 240.
 Glover, T. R., 59, 80.
 Goodell, Wm., 210, 218, 220, 221.
 Gordon, Chinese, 111.
 Grant, Frederick C., 6.
 Gregory the Great, 124.
 Greville, Ewing, 195.
 Grisar, Hartmann, 129, 132.
 Grubb, Edward, 31, 64, 70.
 Guinebert, Charles, 83.

- Hagedorn, F. E., 179.
 Hallam, Henry, 111.
 Hammond, J. H., 213.
 Hammond, J. L., and Barbara,
 197, 200, 205, 206.
 Hannah, I. C., 150.
 Hapgood, Norman, 303.
 Hardman, O., 150.
 Harnack, Adolf, 53, 59, 62, 69, 75,
 78, 114, 115, 150.
 Harper, Wm., 213.
 Hayes, C. J. H., 231.
 Hell, 17 ff., 292.
 Hickeringill, Edmond, 193.
 Hicks, G., 227.
 Hillis, N. D., 224, 225.
 Howard, S., 303.
 Hughes, Rupert, 303.
 Human Nature, 50.
 Hurd, J. C., 210.
 Huttman, Maude A., 88.

 Ignatius, 77.
 Immorality, 57, 66 ff., 157 ff.
 Immortality, 44, 47.
 Incomes, 252.
 Indifference, 30.
 Indulgences, 179 ff.
 Industrial Defense Association,
 303.
 Industrial Revolution, 196 ff.
 Industrialism, 230.
 Inequality, 251.
 Infant Baptism, 176 ff.
 Inge, Dean, 83.
 Innocent VIII, 178.
 Inoculation, 149.
 Inquisition, 120 ff.
 Intelligence, 278 ff.
 Intolerance, 73.
 Ives, George, 121.

 Jackson, Stonewall, 112.
 Jews, 136 ff.
 John the Baptist, 10.
 John X, 159.
 John XII, 159.
 John XXII, 182.
 Johnson, James Weldon, 291.
 Jones, Rufus M., 134.
 Julius II, 178.
 Justin Martyr, 70.

 Kaiser William, 196.
 Key Men of America, 303.
 Kings, 191 ff., 261.
 Klausner, Joseph, 3, 8, 10.
 Ku Klux Klan, 242, 248.

 Laidlaw, Walter, 227.
 Laidler, H. W., 291.
 Lea, H. C., 124, 126, 128, 154, 157,
 158, 159, 160, 161, 170, 179, 180,
 181.
 League for Independent Political
 Action, 291.
 Lecky, W. E. H., 65, 68, 74, 79,
 109, 120, 140, 141, 153, 156, 157,
 176, 193, 197, 208.
 Lee, Robt. E., 112.
 Leo X, 182.
 Leo XII, 124.
 Locke, Alain, 247.
 Lovett, R. M., 291.
 Luchaire, A., 190.
 Ludlow, James, 93, 94.
 Luther, Martin, 103, 128, 141, 146.
 Lynching, 240 ff.

 Macartney, C. E., 271.
 Macaulay, 199.
 Machen, J. G., 272.
 Magic, 148, 164 ff.
 Malthus, 200.
 Mandeville, B., 202.
 Marcus Aurelius, 69, 74.
 Margoliouth, Moses, 195.
 Martensen, H., 108, 195.
 Marriage, 154.
 Massey, Edward, 149.
 Materialism, 265.
 Mather, Cotton, 262.

- Maycock, A. T., 122, 125.
 McCown, C. C., 3.
 McGiffert, A. C., 102.
 McPherson, G. N., 272.
 Melanchthon, 146, 191.
 Michaud, J. F., 92, 94.
 Milbourne, Luke, 194.
 Militarism, 233, 234.
 Millionaires, 252.
 Milman, H. H., 114, 117.
 Mirbt, Carl, 124.
 Monasticism, 151.
 Moon, P. T., 233.
 Moore, Geo. Foote, 3, 8, 10, 24.
 Morality, 65 ff.
 Motley, J. L., 98, 99, 100, 101.
 Mullinger, J. B., 96.
 Munzer, Thomas, 97.
 Murray, R. H., 103.
 Murry, J. Middleton, 14, 26, 40.
 Muste, A. J., 291.
 Mystery Religions, 82.

 National Asso. for Advancement
 of Colored People, 243.
 National Bureau of Economic Re-
 search, 255.
 National Civic Federation, 303.
 National Industrial Conference
 Board, 253.
 National Security League, 303.
 Nationalism, 231.
 Nearing, Scott, 242.
 Negroes, 241, 297.
 New Economic Order, 288.
 New Political Party, 290.
 Neibuhr, Reinhold, 278, 288, 291.

 Osborne, Henry F., 145.
 Owen, E. C. E., 73, 75.
 Oxenham, John, 316.

 Pacifists, 299.
 Pain, 309.

 Paley, Wm., 204.
 Palmer, B. M., 216.
 Palmer, Frederick, 97.
 Parsons, E. W., 11.
 Patriarchs, 120.
 Patriotism, 27, 72.
 Pearlson, G., 136.
 Perris, G. H., 110.
 Persecution, 73 ff., 113 ff., 144 ff.,
 300 ff.
 Personal Purity, 64 ff.
 Petty, Wm., 203.
 Pharisees, 9.
 Philip II, 98.
 Philo, 84.
 Pillsbury, P., 212.
 Pius IV, 178.
 Polycarp, 76.
 Postell, J. C., 215.
 Poverty, 202 ff., 252 ff., 281,
 309.
 Power, 177 ff., 257.
 Priest, Josiah, 215.
 Property, 177 ff., 185 ff.
 Puritans, 134, 162.

 Quakers, 134.

 Race Relations, 25.
 Racial Discrimination, 240 ff.
 Rainy, Robert, 85.
 Recent Gains in American Civil-
 ization, 3.
 Representative Government, 286.
 Republican Party, 288.
 Retaliation, 21, 64.
 Revolts of Jews, 7, 12.
 Revolutionary War, 104.
 Reyburn, Hugh Y., 131.
 Robertson, J. A., 31.
 Roman Rule, 4 ff., 33.
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 112, 226.
 R. O. T. C., 300.
 Ruskin, 104.

- Russia, 139, 169.
 Ryan, J. A., 263.
 Rydberg, Viktor, 168.
- Sacco-Vanzetti, 239.
 Sacrifice, 51, 72 ff., 296 ff.
 Sadducees, 8.
 Sadler, M. T., 202.
 Salvation, 44, 55 ff.
 Schaff, Philip, 109, 151, 152, 159,
 160, 161, 179, 182.
 Science and Religion, 143.
 Scott, E. F., 14, 83.
 Seignobos, Charles, 185.
 Self-Interest, 199, 250.
 Serfdom, 185 ff.
 Sergius III, 159.
 Servetus, 130.
 Shaftesbury, 207.
 Simeon Stylites, 153.
 Simkhovitch, V. G., 3, 7, 12.
 Simony, 177.
 Slavery, 56, 63, 207 ff.
 Smith, Adam, 199, 200.
 Smith, Preserved, 97, 98, 103, 122,
 124, 182.
 Smith, R. T., 98.
 Smith, Wm. H., 219.
 Social Organization, 283 ff.
 Socialist Party, 290.
 Solitude, 311 ff.
 Speculation, 266.
 Sperry, 158, 161.
 Spiritual Resources, 305 ff.
 Spring, Gardiner, 172.
 Stanley, A. P., 88, 115.
 St. Bartholomew's Day, 98.
 St. Bernard, 183.
 Stewart, George, 31.
 Stowe, H. B., 214, 218, 220.
 Strife, 249, ff. 264, 282.
 Strong, P. N., 172.
 St. Theodore, 63.
 Sunday, Wm., 227.
 Superstition, 164 ff.
 Suppression, 302.
- Swain, J. W., 150.
 Swaney, C. B., 107, 108.
- Tarbox, I. N., 163.
 Tate, Allen, 112.
 Tawney, R. H., 183, 205.
 Taxation of Jews, 6.
 Taylor, G. R. S., 111.
 Taylor, Graham, 245.
 Taylor, Henry Osborn, 84, 110,
 150, 151, 152, 162, 183.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 104, 171, 192.
 Temple Incident, 21.
 Tertullian, 58.
 Thomas, Norman, 291.
 Thompson, Herbert, 123, 124.
 Thompson, J. W., 95, 110, 185,
 186, 189, 190, 191.
 Thorndike, 166, 167.
 Thornwell, J. H., 217.
 Titelmann, 99.
 Torrey, R. A., 175.
 Torture, 125.
 Townsend, Joseph, 202.
 Trade Unions, 206.
 Treason, 27.
 Tucker, Josiah, 203.
- Urban II, 92.
- Vaccination, 149.
 Valerian, 73.
 Vanderlaan, E. C., 270, 271, 272.
 Vested Rights, 26, 28.
 Villard, O. G., 291.
 Violence, 68 ff., 128 ff., 219, 244.
- Wages, 254 ff.
 Wall, Wm., 176.
 Walsh, J. J., 191.
 Walsh, Senator, 303.
 Ward, H. F., 250, 282.
 Wars of Religion, 95 ff.
 War, 68 ff., 87 ff., 101 ff., 224 ff.,
 281, 298.

- Webb, Sidney, 202, 203, 206, 207.
Weber, N. A., 177.
Weigall, Arthur, 80.
Wesley, John, 141, 146.
Westermarck, Edward, 102, 104,
108, 209.
Whately, Archbishop, 199.
White, A. D., 140, 141, 144, 147,
149.
Whitfield, John, 193.
Wieman, H. N., 305.
Wilberforce, 205.
Wilbur, Secretary, 234.
Williams, A. R., 169.
Williams, Howard Y., 291.
Williams, Roger, 133.
Wilson, Henry, 215.
Witches, 139 ff.
Wilson, James, 213, 217.
Women, 67.
Yahweh, 16.
Young, Arthur, 202.
Zealots, 10.
Zung, Leopold, 136.



1 1012 01247 2819

Date Due

AP 15 '42



